

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

*Vol. XVIII.*

*January, 1912.*

*No. 1.*

---

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit.* c. 6.

---

PUBLISHED BY  
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,  
BALTIMORE.

# The Catholic University Bulletin.

---

*Vol. XVIII.*

*January, 1912.*

---

*No. 1.*

## ST. AUGUSTINE.

---

It is difficult to write about St. Augustine without appearing to exaggerate. Even to cite the encomiums of critics and historians, to put together the sentences in which great men have expressed their estimate of his greatness would leave one open to the charge of indulging in panegyric where critical examination would be more appropriate. On the other hand, one cannot open up the subject "St. Augustine" without some reference to the extraordinary greatness of his genius. He was great as a philosopher; he was still greater as a theologian. He was great in the personal sanctity which he attained, great in his zeal and prudence as a Churchman, great in his faults as well as in his virtues, and greatest of all, perhaps, in the simplicity of heart which enables us to see him as he really was. He combined, says one admirer, "the powerful and penetrating logic of Plato, the deep scientific conceptions of Aristotle, the knowledge and intellectual suppleness of Origen, the grace and eloquence of Basil and Chrysostom." We may add that if he is second to the other great Christian teachers in any one respect, if he is lacking in the subtleness of metaphysical skill which characterized Athanasius, if he is inferior to Ambrose in practical institutional genius, if he is excelled by Aquinas in technical skill and in the gift of systematisation, he stands above them all in tenderness of heart and the supreme power of reaching the soul of his reader. Catholics have called him



"The greatest doctor of the Catholic World." But Protestants have claimed him too. Harnack has said "No man since Paul is comparable to him," and less thoughtful Protestant writers have maintained that "Augustine is the father of evangelical protestantism as Pelagius is of Catholicism." Evidently it is not easy to praise St. Augustine and at the same time keep within the bounds of reasonableness and of logical consistency. It is safer, therefore, to refrain from the attempt to estimate his genius, and to give mostly from his own writings, an account of the life and character of the man and a sketch of his system of thought in its broad outlines and its main tendencies.

One phase of his genius, however, is a matter of unanimity among historians. His influence has been unique and perennial. He was the great, indeed, the only teacher, of Latin Christianity in its higher problems for eight hundred years. And even after the influence of other great teachers was established, after Thomas of Aquin had come to be the acknowledged master in the schools, after Aristotelianism had supplanted Platonism in the seats of learning, outside the schools, in the non-academic world, Augustine still taught and still teaches in simple, untechnical language, in the fervid eloquence that flows from heart to heart, the lessons of Christian piety. We go to other teachers for our theology and our technical philosophy, although to him those other teachers owe much of what they have to give; but to him directly we go for inspiration, consolation and spiritual enlightenment. If scholastic theology leaves the heart cold and the philosophy of the schools fails to solve the problems of life, there is in St. Augustine a source of spiritual warmth and a wealth of ethical inspiration on which the world will always draw as long as it appreciates the Christian view of life and the Christian way of living.

Our materials for the biography of St. Augustine are, fortunately, both abundant and varied. We have, first of all, his own "Confessions," that inimitable autobiography, so full of human interest. It is a superlative work in its own class. Others may equal it in sincerity and candor: they may show

an author great enough to reveal without mercy, but not without shame, his own imperfections, his own defects, his own sins. But no other "Confessions" are so serenely set in the key of the sublime. No other work of the kind is so elevated in tone and style as to avoid the commonplace, the sordid and even the vulgar. For Augustine had the courage to put his narrative in the form of a prayer and to lay bare his soul to His maker, so simply, so directly, with such complete absence of self-consciousness that as we read we sometimes feel that so clean a confession was indeed meant for no human ear, but for the ear and heart of Infinite Mercy Itself. There we have the story of Augustine's soul. Elsewhere, he left us the history of his mind. He was great enough to be able to acknowledge that he sometimes made mistakes. This is sometimes said to be an unmistakable sign of greatness. It is, at least, one of the signs. During his long career as a writer and a teacher Augustine was often obliged to change his opinions and to revise his earlier convictions. All these corrections he collected in a work called "Retractions," which is, therefore, a record of his opinions as the "Confessions" is a narrative of his inner spiritual experiences. We have a third source, the "Life of Augustine," written by his friend Possidius, which is an account of his public career, especially of his work as bishop and defender of the faith. With these three documents before us we have but to choose in order to get a complete and integral picture of the man, the scholar and the Churchman.

Augustine was born at Tagaste in Numidia about the year 354. His father, Patricius, was a pagan; but, owing to the example of Monica, that ideal Christian wife and mother, he was received into the Christian Church before his death in 371. The boy Augustine was brought up a Christian, although, in conformity with the custom then prevalent, he was not baptized. How carefully his pious mother watched over his early training, we can infer from what we know of her character. That she had a determining influence on her son's spiritual life is a fact so well known that it need not detain us here. In his "Confessions" he makes open and touching allusion to the



perseverance with which she prayed for his conversion to Catholic Christianity. When, in spite of her vigilant care, at Tagaste and, afterwards, during his school days, at Carthage, he gave himself up to a life of pleasure; when, as the renowned teacher of rhetoric, he was attracted by the Manichaean heresy and openly joined that sect, she followed him in spirit into all his waywardness of heart and intellect, besieging heaven with her prayers and her tears. "She mourned for me," he writes, "more than mothers weep the bodily deaths of their children." This, as has been said, is a fact so well known as to be almost a commonplace in literary biography. Behind the figure of Augustine, the convert and saint, is the gentle, patient, figure of his saintly mother. And that night at Ostia, on the eve of her death, when, looking out on the sea and the stars, they discoursed of heavenly things! Who has not read the noble passage in which the philosopher, now a Christian philosopher, showed the way "from Nature up to Nature's God" and the still nobler passage in which speaks the heart of the woman and the mother, now happy in her son's conversion? "Son, for mine own part, I have no further delight in anything in this life, I know not what I do here any longer, or to what end I am here, now that my hopes in this world are accomplished. One thing there was for which I desired to tarry longer in this life, that I might see thee a Catholic Christian ere I died. My God hath done this for me more abundantly, since I now see thee despising all earthly happiness in order to become his servant." Never was hope crowned by gladness, or sorrow long patient finally rewarded, more eloquently expressed than in this sublime *Nunc dimittis*. But what is not so generally known is the extraordinary mental power of St. Monica and her unusual aptitude for philosophy. For the thousands who read the scene at Ostia there is hardly one who knows of the conversations which took place at Cassiciacum immediately after Augustine's conversion. There with a few friends whose tastes agreed with his own, the converted rhetorician conducted philosophical debates amid scenes of idyllic simplicity and pastoral peace. In the cool shade of the gardens,

or in the portico of the villa, these friends discussed such themes as Happiness, Order, The Errors of the Platonists; and in all their learned discourse Monica took her part as one who was quite at home in the subtleties of the philosophers. Hear what St. Augustine writes: "Our mother was with us: we had long known her mind and her heart all on fire for the things of God. This we knew by close observation and continual companionship. But in the disputation which I held with my companions on my birthday about a very important matter, it struck me that her mind was so great as to be well adapted to the study of philosophy as any one's ever was."<sup>1</sup> It was evidently a revelation to him; perhaps the joy at his conversion awakened new powers in her mind. "Day by day," he says, "I saw her mind in a new light."<sup>2</sup> He cannot suppress his astonishment "Truly, mother," he writes, "you have stormed the castle of philosophy. You need only the words and you would express yourself like Cicero himself." Perhaps St. Augustine may seem to some to emphasize too much the exceptional nature of his mother's talent. "She had uttered these words so surprisingly that we forgot her sex and thought that some great man had taken his place among us."<sup>3</sup> From the point of view of human interest, it is hard to say which is more enjoyable, the half-concealed surprise on the part of the philosopher, or the genial, sometimes witty disclaimer of the mother, whose modest opinion of herself is put to a severe test.

I have lingered in these details because I consider that without this knowledge of St. Monica in what we must call, I suppose, the stronger side of her character, it would be difficult to understand St. Augustine himself. In all that he wrote there was a certain *femininity*, as his critics call it. In his letters, especially, this is easily remarked. It is not so much a quality of his thought as of the manner in which he expressed his thought. Among the philosophers of Greece there was one who was nicknamed the Mothertaught. Perhaps St. Augustine would be the last to admit that he owed his philosophy to his

<sup>1</sup> *De Ord.* II, 1.<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 45.<sup>3</sup> *De Vita Beata*, 10.



mother. His conversion, indeed, he freely attributed to her prayers; but we have just seen that his sense of loyalty to his own sex struggled hard in the admission that his mother had a talent for philosophy that was by no means common. Nevertheless, unconsciously, perhaps even by the mysterious ways of heredity, he must have owed some of his own talent to her, and the peculiarity of his genius to which I have just called attention would indicate some such derivation.

To return to his career. The dissolute student at Carthage became the brilliant professor of rhetoric, first at Carthage, later at Rome, and finally at Milan. For nine years he had remained an adherent of the Manichaean sect, which holds as its central doctrine the inherent evil of all material things and ascribes all evil, physical and moral, to the agency of the devil. This was a facile solution of a most perplexing problem. But, it was crude, and its crudeness, its vulgar coarseness, in fact, finally broke the spell that bound Augustine to it. Next, he turned to the Platonist philosophers and while still disturbed by the Platonic view, though not quite convinced, he came under the influence of St. Ambrose. These were two minds cast in entirely different moulds. St. Augustine, though an African of Latin descent and race, was a Greek in mind and heart. Ambrose was a Latin, trained in Roman Law and in Roman administration. The Greek mind with its love of artistic excellence and its appreciation of clear-cut ideas, drawn towards Platonism at last as a refuge from the confusion and discord of the sensuous, met the Latin mind with its sense of legal right and its appreciation of the value of institutions, its love of order and dignity and practical adjustment. The soul of Augustine craved for just such food as Ambrose had to offer, and the sermons in the basilica at Milan ended in a ceremony by which the waters of baptism flowed at last on a soul that was weary of its burden of sin and weary too of the war which it had carried on against doubt and error. Unfortunately, historians will not allow us any longer to believe that on this great occasion the *Te Deum*, in which the official Church voices her gratitude to God, sprang spontaneously from



the lips of both the bishop and his convert. We give up the legend with regret, for we think that grand hymn of praise could not have had a more fitting origin, nor has it ever been sung on an occasion more worthy of its majestic cadence.

Once converted to Christianity, Augustine became zealous, according to his nature, in such activities as suited his gifts and seemed to atone for his past offences. He took up the cause of truth against its sceptical opponents in philosophy. He championed the cause of orthodoxy against every form of heresy that had arisen. He became, too, a model shepherd of souls. Called to the See of Hippo in his native Africa, he administered the office of bishop with zeal and self-sacrificing devotion. Both as a pastor and as a writer, he combatted error. But, not content with a negative role, he taught, expounded and explained the truth. Disdaining no part of the duties of a pastor of souls, he preached to the people with the same success with which he wrote against the leaders of great heresies, and condescended even to instruct little children in the rudiments of the Christian faith. His death at Hippo in 430 brought his busy career to an end. It ended also the epoch to which he belonged. For his last days were disturbed by news that the barbarian invaders were before the walls of his episcopal city. Elsewhere these invaders had begun the work of destruction. In the decades that were to follow they were to continue that work, to wipe out the last vestige of Greek and Roman culture, to put an end to the decadent Latin civilization and prepare for the reconstructive activity out of which medieval Europe sprang.

Before passing on to the description of St. Augustine's system of thought, let us take up here a work of his on a topic suggested by this last remark, namely his *City of God*, in which he develops his philosophy of history. When in 410 Rome was captured and despoiled by the Goths under Alaric, the pagans attributed the city's downfall to the impiety of the Christians, and among the Christians themselves there was a good deal of consternation. For both pagans and Christians believed in the sacredness of the eternal city. The pagans had

placed it under the protection of their own deities and the overthrow of those deities by the Christians was, to the pagan mind, the cause of Alaric's success. The Christians, on their side, inherited an unexplained reverence for *Roma Immortalis*. They felt in some vague way that the destinies of the city somehow involved the destinies of the Church, and the destruction of the one seemed to threaten the indefectibility of the other. Indeed, the whole Christian world was shocked at the news of Rome's downfall, and was inclined to consider it a presage to the end of all things. It was the purpose of St. Augustine to show in this treatise that the true City of God is not Rome nor any other city however great, but the whole world, that City of God, of which "glorious things are said." The whole human race constitutes one commonwealth, of which the ruler is Divine Providence, a commonwealth which has for its constitution the Divine law, and for its citizens the children of God in every land and in every clime. Thus, for the first time, a point of view was established for the study of universal history, and a philosophy of history was made possible. In pre-Christian times there was no philosophy of history, because no historian could break through the national or racial prejudice that bound him to a partial and prejudiced view. "Proud Greece all nations else *barbarians* held" and the Roman included even the Greeks in his supercilious contempt of all that was not Roman. The belief that Christ died for all human beings, whether savage or civilized, whether Gentile or Jew, bond or free, ignorant or cultured, was a hard doctrine for the first pagan converts. But it prevailed, and established for the philosophical historian the possibility of viewing all the events of human history from the point of view of "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," a phrase now no longer empty and hollow, as it was in the contention of the Stoic philosophers, but full of practical meaning and put to many a severe test in the actual working out of the Christian system. All nations, then, and all races, are under the divine plan of government; and history, for St. Augustine is the slow, stern, reluctant rule of God's will, which human passion may

resist and human obstinacy may resent, but which works out its purposes in the end, in ways that are mysterious and in results that make demands on our patience and our faith. St. Augustine did not say the last word on the subject. He was followed by others who in some respects succeeded better than he in justifying the ways of God to man. But, he was a pioneer, and his success is to be judged not by detailed applications of his great idea, but by that great idea itself. Others who came after him emphasized other factors in human history: some laid stress on the material factors, others on the influence of great men, others on education and similar human institutions. One does not need to disregard any of these in order to give due credit to him who first viewed all history as the spiritual City of God, and placed above all other forces in history the power of Him who created material forces, sent great men into the world, and gave to the mind of man the power to educate and develop itself. The theological explanation of history is not exclusively theological. It is theological in the sense that it establishes a perspective of historical factors in which all but God are seen in their respective proportions and His power and His will are not denied their overshadowing pre-eminence.

The philosophy of St. Augustine in general is Platonic. That is to say it is a Christian adaptation of Platonism. How far he was read in the genuine works of Plato, and how far he was dependent rather on Neo-Platonic sources is a question which need not be discussed here. It is probable that, like many another since his time, Dante, for example, he was led to the Platonic way of thinking, not by much reading nor by diligent study but by a certain kinship of spirit which drew him to the Platonic philosophy as naturally as the light and heat of the sun draw the leaf and the blossom of the growing plant. He was born a Platonist; he found himself in an atmosphere of Platonism and the appeal which Christianity made to his mind was facilitated by his Platonic habits of thought. So that when he entered finally into the Christian world of thought he saw it all in the light of Platonism.



But, what is Platonism? There are in last analysis but two ways of thinking on the highest problems, the Aristotelian way and the Platonic way. [The Aristotelian way is the way of science; its method is accurate observation, clear definition and sound syllogistic reasoning. It begins with facts and proceeds to laws. The Platonic way is the way of metaphysical poetry: its method is intuitive perception, spiritual comprehension and aesthetic realization. It cares not so much for the facts of the external world as for those of our own internal experience. It is interested less in nature than in human nature, and concerns itself less with human nature than with the world of intelligences that is above us. If there is an upward way, from the world of minerals, plants, animals and men, to the higher truths of a world above us, that is the Aristotelian way of knowledge. If there is a downward way, from the world of intelligences above us to our own world of human nature and thence descending through the realms of animal life, plant life and the mineral kingdom, that is the Platonic way.] If the sceptic denies the validity of these ways, Aristotle tries to convince him, Plato is content with trying to persuade him. [Aristotle supposes nothing: he calls our attention to facts of experience, and then goes on to reason on those facts. Plato supposes much, takes much for granted. He takes for granted the existence above us of a world of Ideas, in which there is no change, no imperfection, no decay, where everything around us exists in a higher, in a more perfect, in an absolutely perfect form.] He cannot prove this, he can only ask us to believe in it because it is beautiful, because our heart longs for it, because, if we did not believe in it, then our plight would be a very sad one indeed. Do you perceive here the blending of the emotional and the esthetic with the purely intellectual? Do you catch the appeal to the love of beauty as well as to the truth-hunger in us? That is Platonism. [The Platonist is enamoured of the beauty of Truth, the Aristotelian is concerned about the truth of Beauty.]

St. Augustine was a Platonist. He shows this in his method, and he shows it in the contents of his philosophy. There are

two subjects in which his interest as a philosopher centers, and they are God and the human soul. The phenomena of nature, the events of history, the experience which is commonly supposed to make up our "lives," in a word, the "fleeting show" that passes in part before the eyes of each of us, and is in part recorded for us as the experience of others—the world of nature, the world of history, the world of my experiences and of yours—all this is the object indeed, of knowledge. It is not mere illusion. But it is not the object of Wisdom (*Sapientia*) or the highest knowledge. The highest knowledge has for its object spiritual truth, God and the soul. And which of these comes first? St. Augustine acknowledges that there is a *trace* of divinity in the material world and in history. It is possible, by searching, to find in the study of nature and of historical events intimations of a divine origin. But the *image* of God is in our own souls. In a pure heart and an untroubled soul God is mirrored; as in the clear, unruffled surface of the lake one may see reflected the green hills and rugged rocks that surround it, or rather, let us say, the calm, unhurrying courses of the stars that are shining in their immense distances above it. *Noverim me, noverim Te*. "To know God one must first know oneself." This, however, is only part of the truth. To know ourselves, we must know God. And thus, like a true Platonist, he holds that the lower is known by the higher; the way of knowledge is the downward way. "I believe in order that I may understand." *Credo ut intelligam*. Faith is not merely intended to baffle the understanding, to bring reason to its senses, to teach us how to become humble intellectually. It aids reason. It throws a flood of light on the problems which reason unaided cannot solve. And of no class of truths is this so strikingly true as of those which relate to ourselves. We are full of unexplained mysteries. There is in us a longing for happiness even before we know what happiness is. There is in us a hunger for truth even before we know what truth is. We cannot understand this enigma until we look above and beyond us and see Infinite Happiness and Infinite Truth. Then, we begin to know that it is a longing for God and a

hunger for God that make heart and mind restless until they rest in Him.

Let us try and understand this attitude. There have been other great thinkers who called our attention to man's desire for happiness and knowledge. What is peculiar to St. Augustine is the way that he explains this desire, and the use that he makes of it in his philosophy. Others, be they philosophers or poets or great moral teachers, or men of science or philanthropists, have stood in awe of man's capacity for happiness and knowledge. They have treated that fundamental need of our nature with respect and even with reverence. They have shown us how passion thwarts us in our search for happiness, how self-interest blinds us and false pleasure leads us astray. They have set up the guiding lights to show us the true way, and urged all the virtues which are necessary if we are to succeed. St. Augustine cuts across all their carefully planned directions. "Go not outside thyself," he writes; "in the inner man, in thine own soul, dwell happiness and truth." It is not by the study of nature, then, nor by the careful consideration of how others succeeded or failed; it is not by science nor by the study of history or biography nor by the observation of life around us that we are to find the path to happiness and to knowledge, but by studying ourselves and going up to God as the source of our own half articulate longings, that we are to learn true wisdom. Introspection thus takes precedence over observation. But introspection itself is only the preliminary to contemplation. The heart must be pure, the soul must be clear and untroubled, so that when we look into it we see the reflection of the Happiness which is infinite and the Truth which is eternal.

Occasion required that St. Augustine should formulate proofs for the existence of God, and there are many such proofs throughout his voluminous writings. But, let me emphasize here a remarkable fact. These proofs are for the doubter or the unbeliever, for him who hesitates or who has had the temerity to deny the existence of a Supreme Being. For St. Augustine himself, the existence of God is not a conclusion. It is rather a premise. It is a presupposition of all knowledge.



Thus, he argues "In order to know anything as good or beautiful or true, and to distinguish it from what is not good or beautiful or true, we must possess a standard of judgment and comparison. The standard, in order to be trustworthy, must be immutable and, in order to be always available, must be always present to our minds. Such a standard, immutable, omnipresent truth and goodness and beauty can be God and God alone. Therefore God exists." Here an Aristotelian would have much to say by way of criticism. But we are not criticising. We are describing a state of soul, and the state of soul is Platonic. St. Augustine is not reasoning himself into belief in God; he is revealing the fact that for him God is a presupposition of all thought. With the thought of God we start, and by means of it we justify our judgments and account for all our thoughts.

It is the same with the problem of happiness. Every man desires to be happy. Some seek happiness in those things which do not really embody it, but present a phantom semblance of it. They spend their lives chasing shadows and are lured by false appearance away from those things in which happiness truly consists. But even they desire happiness. Now, they could not desire what is entirely unknown to them. Therefore, there must be in their souls an intimation, a vague impression of true happiness. God must have touched them with the divine fire. And is it not a curiously pathetic thought, that the criminal and the libertine must unconsciously have caught fire from the Infinite Happiness of God, to set ablaze in their souls the conflagration that leads to the tragedy of their own lives and the wreck of the lives of others? God is, then, a presupposition of action as well as of thought. He planted in every human heart that insatiable thirst for Truth which leads to thought and the equally unquenchable desire for happiness which leads to action. These are the two mighty arms which He stretches out to His creatures, and there is no true rest or satisfaction until they fold over the returned prodigal or clasp the pure soul of the saint that has never faltered in his life-journey towards them.

There is emotionalism here as well as philosophy. But,

where there is Platonism emotionalism cannot be absent. That is why Platonism has been nearer the hearts of the people than any other philosophy. It speaks the language of sentiment, which all understand. It is not technical in its phraseology, it requires no preliminary training in dialectic on the part of those who would make progress in its method. It demands a pure heart and a clean conscience, and commits its case to these in preference to the rules of syllogistic reasoning or a profound study of natural science. That is why Platonism appealed to the mystic and to the successful popular preacher. And that is why all during the later Middle Ages, when Aristotelianism was dominant, there were many pious souls who found in the Platonism of Augustine a solace and an inspiration which they sought in vain in the philosophy of the schools. The author of the *Imitation of Christ* was one of these. His contemptuous allusions to accurate definition and formal proof are to be understood as a protest against the Aristotelian way of philosophising.

Besides emotionalism there is in the central doctrine of St. Augustine very much of the personal element. We know how troubled and intellectually how checkered his own life was. He may, indeed, be said to have "tried all things." It took him long to realize that in his waywardness he was doing violence to his own better nature. But when he did realize it, his response was generous, wholesouled, unreserved. He could not help making his own case that of human nature in general, and exalting into a universal principle the way of salvation which he found happiness in following. This is Platonic too. The Aristotelian subjects every conception of science to the discipline of logic; the Platonist tries every sentiment in the crucible of spiritual experience. In the literature of the Aristotelian school it is mind speaking to mind. In the writings of the Platonist heart speaks to heart. This too contributes to the popularity of St. Augustine, not only among those who agree with him, but also among those who, while failing to share his beliefs, cannot resist the fascination of a genius that takes us, as it were, into the sacred intimacies of personal

friendship and addresses us with the directness and even familiarity that give to friendly intercourse its chief charm.

I have tried to give an idea of how St. Augustine puts God at the beginning and at the end of all human action and human thought. "From God to God" is the soul's history. But, what is the soul? Here, once more, we may see the Platonist approach a problem of philosophy in a manner peculiar to his school. One of St. Augustine's greatest gifts was his power of observing and portraying states of mind. He knew his own soul and he had the ability to describe what he saw in the souls of others. Yet, he does not appear as a Humanist, so to speak, in psychology. The soul, for him, is of supreme interest because it came from God, because God is its life and its light, and because it goes to God when this earthly career is over. He does not agree with the Platonists who taught the pre-existence of all human souls in an intelligible world above us before they were united with the body. The soul was created, but when it came into the world it brought with it "clouds of glory," not, indeed, ideas acquired in a former existence, but the germs, as it were, of ideas which it develops here below into a knowledge of God and of spiritual truth. Plato, as is well known, taught that all knowledge is recollection; that to learn is to recall what we knew before in a previous existence. St. Augustine will not go so far as that. Yet, he says the soul when it first learns of God seems to recall ("reminisci") a knowledge of God, for it lives in Him and lived in Him from the first moment of its existence.<sup>4</sup> Hence the exceptional importance which he attaches to Memory. Memory, he teaches, is a faculty of the soul coördinate in dignity with intelligence and will. Recent psychology has come to regard memory as a faculty somehow inferior in dignity to the other powers of the mind. And the popular estimate agrees with recent psychology. If you praise a man's judgment, or his reason, or his power of observation, he is, usually, pleased, and takes it as a compliment. If you say that he has a good memory you hardly please him at all; you seem, indeed, to damn him with faint praise. And we all

<sup>4</sup> *De Trin.*, Lib. xii and xiv.



know how readily one admits that he has a "poor memory," while the admission "My judgment, or my reason, or my power of observation is at fault," is very rare indeed. St. Augustine does not share this popular depreciation of memory. For him, memory is a most important power of the soul. In it are stored up, so to speak, our unthought ideas. "When a man begins to reflect," he says, "he will find in his own soul thoughts which he already knew, but on which he has not hitherto reflected."<sup>5</sup> When, in search of truth, we wander out into the world of nature, or of history, we should know that truth is not there, outside us, but in our own souls, and all that we can get from the outside world is a hint that sends us back upon our own thoughts and causes us to reflect on them. We are, if a trivial comparison may be allowed here, like the absent-minded man who looks all over his room for the pen that is behind his ear or the spectacles that he is wearing all the time. Truth is in us, and all we have to do is to reflect on it, in order to make it our own. Thus, Memory assumes a rôle of very great dignity and very great importance in our mental life. It is the storehouse out of which the thinking man brings "new things and old."

This coördination of Memory with Intelligence and Will makes it possible for St. Augustine to maintain that the human soul is an image of the Trinity. "Three in one" is a description of the faculties of the soul and the substance of the soul, with which they are really identical. Here, again, the point of view is Platonic. The fruit of the study of the soul is not merely a deeper and a clearer knowledge of ourselves. Psychology does not merely tell us what we are in our own nature and what our place is in the world of nature around us. Its fruit is a knowledge of higher spiritual truths, and its effect is to teach us how we stand related to the spirit world above us. The knowledge of our own souls is a Jacob's ladder leading up into the regions of light inaccessible, on which lessons of spiritual import are continually ascending and descending. This doctrine more than any other gave life and con-

<sup>5</sup> *De Trin.*, XIV, Cap. V.

tinued influence to St. Augustine's philosophy in medieval times. Even in the darkest ages, when very little attention was given to psychology, and there was no original effort to think out the problems of mind, this notion persisted that the soul of man is an image of the Trinity, and that by studying the threefold mental life in ourselves we may attain to some imperfect realization of the greatest of Christian mysteries.

There is, it need hardly be said, much more in the philosophy of St. Augustine than his attitude towards the problem of God and the problem of the soul. And besides, his philosophy, is his great, imposing, complex, system of theology, with its discussion of Free Will and Predestination, Grace and Sanctification, the question of Divine Providence, the problem of Evil, the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Trinity and the nature of the Church's Sacramental system. All those have to be passed over, and many questions of philosophy, which it would take too long to discuss. Enough has, I hope, been said to show what manner of thinker St. Augustine was. He was the Plato of Christianity. The Platonic view, as has been said, came naturally to him. It suited his mental temperament, and it satisfied the age in which he lived. One may not dare to say that as a philosopher he improved on Plato, but it may be said, without belittling Plato, that St. Augustine, as a Christian thinker, added much to Platonism by which Platonism was richer, more vital, and better adapted to the needs of humanity. He was a popularizer in the best sense. And this accounts for his influence which was, and is, great even among those who have no special interest in philosophy and theology. He had the genuine humility that goes with true greatness. His great gifts of intellect command our admiration and respect, but, it is the greatness of his heart that binds us to him in love and, if one may say so, in friendship. We admire him in his great effort to systematise Christian truth as he understood it, but we like best to picture the mighty mind, whose struggle was with the giant spirits of heresy and error, condescending to the level of the minds of little children and smoothing over the difficulties that lie in their path of knowl-

edge. His manual on how to teach Catechism to the unlettered does him more credit, we think, than all his learned works on philosophy and theology. It was inspired by the same motive that inspired all his efforts. Perhaps the keynote to his complicated character is given us in the sublime words with which St. Monica concludes one of the dialogues on philosophy: "Yes, that is, beyond all doubt, the happy life which we must strive to attain in unshakable faith, enthusiastic hope and glowing love." <sup>6</sup>

WILLIAM TURNER.

<sup>6</sup> *De Vita Beata*, 35.



## A DEMOCRATIC KING OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

---

At first blush that phrase of Dr. Walsh "the thirteenth, the greatest of centuries" seems very bold indeed. To the superficial reader of history, to the legions who are duped by the vulgar clap-trap anent the "Dark Ages," to those who consider our modern era as superior to the middle age as is the strong man in the prime of life to the infant in swaddling clothes, the title of the Doctor's work must have seemed only an expression of exaggerated enthusiasm, or an attempt to prove the unprovable. No doubt they received it with a smile of amused contempt—with a feeling somewhat akin to that of the Jews of old when they put their famous question: "Can any thing good come out of Nazareth?" But their amusement and contempt must have simmered down considerably on reading the Doctor's able defence of his thesis; for he has shown, to the complete satisfaction of all unbiased readers, that his favorite cycle was at least very wide awake, not alone in the field of speculation, but in the practical sciences and the useful arts as well.

The present writer has as yet seen no reference to the fact that this same thirteenth century furnishes us with the most striking example in all history of a genuinely democratic régime. Not indeed a democracy in the strict modern sense of the term—with its widely extended suffrage and its (at least theoretical) supremacy of the people—but a democracy nevertheless in a very true sense of the word: in all that makes a democracy worth while: in an administration of the most impartial justice, in the equality of all before the law, and in a ruler who was one of the most thoroughly democratic men of all times.

The assertion will doubtless be deemed as bold as Dr. Walsh's—perhaps even bolder—and far less credible. All well-informed men know, of course, that there were republics in ancient Greece and Rome. They know too that the Swiss

Republic struck its roots in this very century that we are writing about. They may even know that the little republic of Andorra can trace its origin back to the days of Charlemagne, and that there has been a tiny republic—San Marino—in the Papal States for nearly three centuries. Yet, in spite of their knowledge, it is no slander to say that most Americans believe in their heart of hearts that there never was a real republic, or real democratic rule, until our own glorious commonwealth sprang into existence. With their notions of the much-decried, and oftentimes much-misunderstood, theory of the divine right of kings, they would never think of looking for a type of the best democracy in a European monarch—least, of all, perhaps, in a French monarch, and a monarch of the Middle Ages at that! And yet, paradoxical as it may seem, it is none the less true that one of the most genuinely democratic administrations in the world's history was that of a mediæval French king.

No thoughtful reader can lay down the *Memoirs* of that honest and lovable old chronicler, the *Sieur de Joinville*, without being firmly convinced that Louis the Ninth was one of the most democratic, as well as one of the wisest and best, of rulers. The picture the average man forms to himself of a mediæval monarch is that of an extraordinarily high and mighty personage, proud and aloof, difficult of approach, hedged about with a sort of divinity, standing upon a lofty pedestal to receive the homage, and almost the adoration, of his subjects; of a man who acted as though he were a being apart from, and by his very nature superior to, those whom he governed; acting often, in fact, as if he considered himself a being of another and much higher species. To such, no doubt, the caption of this article will look like veriest nonsense. "A democratic king" is a contradiction in terms. "A democratic French king" is worse; and as for "a democratic French king of the thirteenth century," the idea is simply ridiculous. Notwithstanding all this, we venture to assert that there never existed a more truly democratic ruler than Louis the Ninth of Mediæval France; never a ruler more easy of access, never a

kinder or a more sympathetic. Nor was his democracy a thing of fits and starts. It was absolutely consistent and unvarying. It was not the offspring of a worldly-wise policy, but the result of a genuine affection for his people. It was not founded on expediency or utility, but deeply and firmly rooted in the eternal principle of charity towards God and his fellow men.

When Louis came to the throne he found a rather slipshod method of dealing out justice prevailing throughout his dominions. The great feudal chieftains, or "lords of the manor," were, to all practical intents and purposes, absolute masters in their domains; not only landlords and executives, but also, to a large extent, lawmakers, judges and juries. In the patriarchal state this might do very well; but it was certainly not very satisfactory in the feudal state. No doubt there were many just and upright nobles who would scorn to take a mean advantage of their tremendous power, but the system, or lack of system, left entirely too much authority in the hands of grasping or revengeful petty sovereigns who would not hesitate to abuse it whenever it was to their interest to do so. Louis set himself to remedy this defect by giving his people that wise code of laws known as "*Les Établissements de St. Louis*," and created a new judicial organization—setting up in the various provinces royal courts of justice, or parliaments, to supersede the jurisdiction of the oftentimes arbitrary and unjust "lords of the manor."

I am not citing this great and good work of the saintly king as the strongest proof of his democracy: for Justinian and Napoleon too gave some very wise and just laws, and certainly they were not very excellent types of the democrat. But, taken in connection with the long and solid array of indisputable proofs that follow, it is well worth noticing. Louis not only framed wise laws, but saw too that they were well and wisely executed. He personally superintended the administration of justice whenever he had an opportunity and—what is most commendable and most characteristic of the man—his methods of dealing out justice were genuinely democratic. Never was there a juster, and seldom a wiser, judge.



De Joinville gives us an excellent portrait of Louis in his judicial capacity—so excellent that the imagination can readily picture the great monarch as he appeared on these occasions—rather plainly clad, sitting at the foot of his bed, or leaning against an old oak tree in the Wood of Vincennes, or again, seated on a carpet in the Jardin de Paris, with his people round about him—the father in the midst of his family—listening patiently, weighing the evidence impartially and passing sentence in strictest justice and equity, indifferent as to whether it affected friend or foe.

A loyal and devoted son of the Church and a staunch friend of the churchmen, he never allowed his friendship for them to make him swerve one iota from the narrow path of justice or square-dealing. On one very notable occasion, as De Joinville informs us, he preferred to array against him the whole French episcopate rather than betray his conscience in a matter of the kind. In the words of the old chronicler: "I saw him yet another time in Paris, when all the prelates of France had asked to speak with him, and the king went to the palace to give them audience. And there was present Guy of Auxerre . . . and he spoke to the king on behalf of all the prelates, after this manner: 'Sire, the lords who are present, archbishops and bishops, have directed me to tell you that Christendom, which ought to be guarded and preserved by you, is perishing in your hands.' The king crossed himself when he heard that word, and said: 'Tell me how may that be.' 'Sire,' said Guy of Auxerre, 'it is because excommunications are at the present day so lightly thought of that people suffer themselves to die before seeking absolution, and will not give satisfaction to the Church. These Lords require you therefore, for the sake of God, and because it is your duty, to command your provosts and bailiffs to seek out all such as suffer themselves to remain excommunicated for a year and a day, and constrain them, by seizure of their goods, to have themselves absolved.' And the king replied that he would issue such commands willingly whensoever it could be shown to him that the excommunicate persons were in the wrong. The bishops said they would

accept this condition at no price whatever, as they contested his jurisdiction in their causes. Then the king told them he would do no other; for it would be against God and reason if he constrained people to seek absolution when the clergy were doing them wrong. 'And of this,' said the king, 'I will give you an example, *viz.*, that of the Count of Brittany who, for seven long years, being excommunicated, pleaded against the prelates of Brittany, and carried his cause so far that the Apostle [the Pope] condemned them all. Wherefore, if I had constrained the Count of Brittany, at the end of the first year to get himself absolved, I should have sinned against God and against him.' " And happily, the lords archbishops and bishops had sense enough to see and admit the reasonableness of the king's contention, for De Joinville tells us that "the prelates then resigned themselves; nor did I ever hear tell that any further steps were taken in the aforesaid matter."

Nor did he ever fail to render a just verdict even when the verdict was against himself and his own interests. He was not the man to take an advantage of his high position or the technicalities of the law. He did not even give himself the benefit of a doubt; but, with all his power to over-rule and over-ride an adverse claimant, and with a host of obliging minions ever ready to advise a self-interested course and to back him up in it, he chose invariably to judge the case in strictest justice as between man and man treating himself and his rights with precisely the same consideration he gave to the meanest of his subjects. The following incident, related by the genial old Seigneur, will serve as an excellent illustration: "My lord Renaud of Trie brought to the saintly man a charter stating that the king had given to the heirs of the Countess of Boulogne, lately deceased, the county of Dammartin in Gouelle. The seal on the charter was broken, so that nought remained save half the legs of the image on the king's seal, and the stool on which the king set his feet. And the king showed the seal to all those who were of his council, and asked us to help him to come to a decision. We all said, without a dissentient, that he was not bound to give effect to the charter. Then he told John

Sarrasin, his chamberlain, to give him a charter which he had asked him to obtain. When he held this charter in his hands, he said: 'Lords, this is the seal I used before I went overseas, and you can see clearly from this seal that the impression on the broken seal is like unto that of the seal that is whole; wherefore I should not dare, in good conscience, to keep the said county.' So he called the lord Renaud of Trie and said: 'I give you back the county.' "

If justice and equity—a genuine regard for the rights of all, of the lowest as well as the highest; if plain and absolutely square dealing between man and man, irrespective of rank or condition, are at the bottom of all true democracy—its strongest foundations and its truest tests (as they certainly are), then most assuredly there never was a better or a more consistent democrat than King Louis the Ninth of France. Here is at least one mediæval monarch who did not consider himself the irresponsible owner of his kingdom; one at least who did not regard himself as a sort of divine personage or a being above all human law. Not for him the motto of the Britisher: "The king can do no wrong," nor that of one of his successors—the Grand Monarque—"L'État, c'est moi." Though wielding his great power at a time when "the divine right of kings" was at its zenith, when a constitutional monarchy was a something practically unknown, he was, by his own choice, a constitutional monarch or, better still, a thorough democrat. And he ruled his kingdom, and conducted himself in his private life, in a democratic spirit that is rarely to be found even in this professedly democratic age of ours.

Another, and a most striking instance of the man's inherent democracy was the freedom and familiarity of speech which he permitted, and encouraged, in those round about him. Not the reluctant yielding that springs from fear or weakness, for he knew no fear; and he was, by all odds, the biggest and strongest man in his kingdom. Nor let it be thought for an instant that he suffered such familiarity as was tolerated by the royal buffoon King James I of England. That is not necessarily an evidence of the democratic spirit; for thoroughgoing



democracy is perfectly compatible with a due sense of dignity and decorum. We cannot imagine King Louis listening to impudence or impertinence, or to anything inconsistent with what he owed to his position. But his democracy of spirit, his strong common sense; most of all, his Christian humility, made him ever lend a willing ear not only to those who had sound advice to give, but also to those who pointed out his faults or gently chided him for his blunders. No doubt this was one of the chief reasons for his attachment to the honest and blunt old Seigneur de Joinville. Plainness of speech, within the bounds of sense and reason, far from being a bar, was rather a passport, to the royal favor. Louis realized that, though a great king, he was after all only a man, with all a man's limitations, and that other men's brains and judgments might be better than his. We have many democrats in authority nowadays, but I wonder how many of them would compare favorably with the mediæval French king in this respect. Imagine the surprise and resentment of a modern republican executive at the bold language which De Joinville never hesitated to adopt in advising his king. When Louis, on one occasion, inquired of him what he expected for his services, the doughty knight answered boldly that he didn't want his money, but would prefer to make another kind of bargain with him; and when the amused monarch asked him what it was, he replied: "You wax wroth when one asks you for anything; so I wish you to make a covenant with me, that if I ask you for anything during the whole of the year, you will not be wroth, and if you refuse it, I on my side will not be wroth either." "When the king had heard this," continues the narrator, "he began to laugh aloud, and said he would keep me in his service on this covenant; and he took me by the hand and led me to the legate and his councillors and told them of the bargain we had made."

While Louis was in Egypt, during his first crusade, the Sultan of Babylon (Cairo) was murdered by his emirs; and it was commonly reported that the conspirators, assembled in council, were thinking seriously of placing the French king on

the dead soldan's throne. Louis asked De Joinville what he thought of the proposition, and the Seigneur bluntly replied: "I told him that had he so taken it, he would have acted like a fool, seeing they had killed their lord; but he told me that in sooth he would not have refused it." Another time when a crusader of rank had forfeited his horse for some misdemeanor, De Joinville tried to get the animal for one of his poor dependants; and on the king's refusal to grant his request, the sturdy seneschal reproached his majesty for failing to live up to their bargain: "And the king answered me that this request was not reasonable, seeing that the horse was still worth eighty livres. And I replied: 'Now have you broken our covenant, for you are wroth with me for my request.' And he said to me, laughing merrily: 'Say what you will, I am not wroth with you.'" And the old chronicler adds with a touch of dry humor, "Nevertheless I did not get the horse for the poor gentleman."

During the king's sojourn at Acre, a host of Armenians going on a pilgrimage to the Holy City, sought to see the saintly monarch of whom they had heard so much: and De Joinville was asked to be their spokesman and get them an interview. "I went to the king," writes the seneschal, "there where he sat in a pavilion, leaning against the pole of the pavilion: and he sat upon the sand, without a carpet, and without anything else under him. I said to him 'Sire, there is here outside a great troop of people from Great Armenia going to Jerusalem: and they pray me, sire, to cause the sainted king to be shown to them; but I have no desire as yet to kiss your bones.' He laughed aloud and told me to go and fetch them, etc."

"While the king was waiting at Hyères," writes De Joinville, "in order to obtain horses to come into France, the Abbot of Cluny presented him with two palfreys, which would to-day be well worth five hundred livres—one for the king himself, and the other for the queen. When the abbot had presented them, he said to the king: 'Sire, I will come again tomorrow to speak to you about my affairs.' When the morrow came, the abbot returned. The king heard him with great

diligence and at great length. When the abbot had departed, I came to the king, and said: 'I should like to ask, if it so pleases you, whether you have given ear to the Abbot of Cluny with the more favor because of those two palfreys that he gave you yesterday?' The king thought a long time, and then said: 'Truly, yes.' 'Sire,' I continued, 'do you know why I have asked you this question?' 'Why,' said he. 'Because, Sire,' I replied, 'I advise and counsel that, when you return to France, you forbid all your sworn counsellors to accept aught from those who have matters to bring before you; for you may rest assured that, if they accept aught, they will listen more willingly, and with greater diligence, to those who have bestowed somewhat upon them; like as you have done to the Abbot of Cluny.' The king called all his council together and incontinently told them what I had said."

The account of a sermon to which the king listened, during this same short sojourn at Hyères, does immense credit to the characters of both the preacher and his royal auditor. It proves conclusively that the king was not unwilling to hear the truth, however unpalatable, and the preacher not afraid to utter it. The preacher in question was a learned and godly Franciscan named Brother Hugh, and this is the way the good brother began his sermon: "Lords, I see too many religious in the king's court and in his company. And, in the first place, I myself am one too many here; and this I say, because the religious here are in no condition to be saved—unless the Holy Scriptures lie to us, which cannot be. For the Holy Scripture tells us that a monk cannot live out of his cloister without mortal sin, any more than a fish can live out of water. And if the religious who are with the king say that his court is a cloister, then I say unto them that it is the very largest cloister that I ever saw. And if they say that in that cloister they can lead a hard life for the salvation of their souls, then I do not believe them; for I tell you that I have eaten with them here of divers meats in great foison, and drunk good wines both strong and clear, etc." He also told the monarch very pointedly how he should rule his realm and wound



up with this fearless advice: "Now let the king have a care, since he is going into his kingdom, that he execute right and justice among his people and remain thereby in the love of God so that God do not take from him both his kingdom and his life." And far from resenting this plainness of speech, the king was so pleased with it that he sought—though without avail—to keep the good brother in his company. Taking De Joinville by the hand, he said to him: "Let us go and beseech him to stay with us." So they went and asked, but the sturdy old monk replied: "Of a truth, sir, I will not do so. I shall go where God will love me better than in the king's company."

It may be objected that these instances of plain bold speech are rather to the credit of the speakers than to that of the king. Creditable to the speakers they certainly are, but certainly still more creditable to the royal heart and head. Men like De Joinville and Brother Hugh were bold with the boldness of conscious, unswerving truth and honesty. But, bold and straightforward, thoroughly honest and truthful though they were, it is not likely that they would have dared to address the king as they did, had they not known for a certainty how he would receive it. They knew well their man; knew him to be, like themselves, a lover of plain speech and plain dealing, a man who preferred the naked truth, how ungainly soever its appearance, to the most highly embellished flattery and sycophancy of the polished courtier. The knight and the monk were both men after his own heart—closely akin to him in character and conduct.

That the great king hearkened to such, and honored them, speaks volumes for both his head and his heart. It proves unmistakably the real greatness of the man. A man with a mean little head or a mean little heart, and at the same time invested with the dignity and authority of a king would not, and could not tolerate such bold enunciations of the truth. It was no undue lack of self-reliance, no sense of timidity or fear for his position, no weakness engendered by an unpractical piety, that prompted Louis to favor such councillors. For there is not the slightest exaggeration in saying that there never

existed a stronger or a more fearless man. He was perfectly well-balanced, level-headed and practical. His sanctity did not interfere in the least with his practicalness as a ruler. He was at the same time a great saint and a great king; for, strange as it may seem to some, the two are perfectly compatible. If any man ever lived up to the motto "*fiat justitia, ruat coelum*," that man was Louis the Ninth of France. Justice—duty—was the guiding star of his life. Nor expediency, nor utility, nor self-interest, nor all the powers of earth and hell, could make him swerve one iota from the path of justice or duty. These assertions are fully borne out by the facts of his life.

When the emirs had murdered the Soldan of Babylon, "one of the (Saracen) knights whose name was Faress-Edin Octay, cut him open with his sword, and took the heart out of his body; and then he came to the king, his hand all reeking with blood, and said: 'What wilt thou give me? for I have slain thine enemy who, had he lived, would have slain thee.' And the king (looking upon him as did David upon the man who boasted of having murdered Saul) answered him never a word." With his army reduced to a comparative handful by war, privation and sickness, Louis was at last forced to make a treaty with the enemy; and though the latter proved treacherous and utterly failed to live up to the agreement, the king was determined to carry out to the very letter his own end of the bargain. One of its main provisions was an indemnity of 200,000 livres to the Saracens for the losses they had sustained, and when Louis discovered that his paymaster had purposely miscounted the money to the enemy's disadvantage, he was very angry. "I command you," said he to the paymaster—the Lord Philip of Nemourz—"by the fealty that you owe to me as being my liegeman, which you are, that if these ten thousand livres have not been paid, you will cause them to be paid without fail."

For his kingly position as such, he had but little regard. He accepted and maintained it only as a matter of duty and an instrument of doing good. As far as he was personally concerned, its loss, I daresay, would not have disturbed in the least

his peace of mind. With all the pleasures and luxuries of life at hand, he would have none of them, but rather elected, for God's sake, to suffer and toil and struggle against the enemies of the Cross till death released him, somewhat prematurely on the inhospitable sands of the African coast.

As regards physical torture and death he was absolutely fearless. In his first expedition he met with reverses and illnesses enough to discourage the bravest heart. At the time of his capture he was suffering terribly from a sort of plague (which De Joinville terms "the sickness of the host") and a violent dysentery which caused him to faint again and again. Still he kept up and on and, when he could easily have escaped, preferred to be taken captive rather than desert his people. And yet, with all this bitter experience before him, knowing full well what he was about to face, he hesitated not to take the Cross a second time, though on setting out he was so sick and weak that he could neither ride horse-back nor be drawn in a chariot, but had to be carried like a helpless infant, in the arms of the faithful De Joinville,—and reached Tunis only to breathe his last a few weeks later.

The Saracens themselves had the greatest admiration for the King's rare qualities of mind and heart—for his courage, his loyalty and steadfastness. They could not bring themselves to understand the secret of his endurance. I have already mentioned the report that, after killing their Sultan, the rebel emirs thought seriously of putting Louis in his place. It seems that the report was well founded, and that Louis would have actually been elected Soldan of Cairo, had it not been for that identical loyalty and steadfastness which his enemies so greatly admired, but feared still more. "The matter proceeded no further," says the chronicler, "because the Saracens said the king was the most steadfast Christian that could be found . . . And they said that if Mohammed had suffered them to be so maltreated as the king had been, they would never have retained their belief in him."

The following incident is well worth giving in its entirety as a striking instance of the point I am trying to make: "The



counsellors of the soldan had tried the king in order to see if he would promise to deliver over to them any of the castles of the Temple, or the Hospital, or any of the castles belonging to the barons of the land . . . and they threatened him and told him that, if he would not do as they wished, they would cause him to be put in the bernicles. Now the bernicles are the most cruel torture that any one can suffer. They are made of two pieces of wood pliable, and notched at the ends with teeth that enter the one into the other; and the pieces of wood are bound together at the end with strong straps of ox-hide; and when they want to set people therein, they lay them on their side, and put their legs between the teeth; and then they cause a man to sit on the pieces of wood. Hence it happens that not half a foot of bone remains uncrushed. And to do the worst they can, at the end of three days, when the legs are swollen, they replace the swollen legs in the bernicles and crush them all once more. To these threats the king replied that he was their prisoner, and that they could do with him according to their will."

Another instance in point is the conduct of Louis on the occasion of the above-mentioned treaty. "The last point in the oath was to this effect; that if the king did not observe his covenants with the emirs, he should be as dishonored as a Christian who denies God and His law and who, in despite of God, spits upon the Cross and tramples upon it. When the king had heard this (deeming it blasphemous) he said that, please God, he would never take that oath. The emirs sent Master Nicholas who knew the Saracen tongue, to the king, and he spake to the king these words: 'Sire, the emirs are greatly incensed, forasmuch as they have sworn what you required of them, whereas you will not swear what they require of you; and be assured that if you do not swear this oath, they will cause your head to be cut off, as well as the heads of your people.' The king replied that they could act in this matter as seemed best to them; but that he liked better to die as a good Christian rather than to live under the wrath of God and His Mother."

We have already given quite a number of incidents to illustrate the king's democratic spirit, his strikingly democratic policy of inviting plain speech, of accepting counsel and even criticism. We have shown conclusively that this characteristic of Louis was not the result of fear or weakness, for every act of his life proves him a man of unusual firmness of character and purpose—a man who knew no fear. But there are other instances still more to the point. In fact we have purposely kept for the last, the strongest and best proofs of his sense of oneness with the people—the common people—his genuine and deep love for them—a love resembling that of Christ, his Master, manifesting itself by a willingness to make great personal sacrifices for them, even to the extent of risking his own life: “We found that the king in person,” says De Joinville, “had caused the bodies of the Christians whom the Saracens had killed (at Sayette) to be duly buried; and he himself, in person, bore the decayed and evil-smelling corpses to the trenches in which they were to be buried; and he did this without ever holding his nostrils as others did.” I have already stated that Louis might easily have escaped the Saracens had he so willed, but that he preferred captivity with his people. Here is the fact as given by our old chronicler: “While we were going down the stream, the king who had upon him the sickness of the host and a very evil dysentery, could easily have gotten away on the galleys if he had been so minded; but he said that, please God, he would never abandon his people. That night he fainted several times; and because of the sore dysentery from which he suffered, etc.” When the king was returning from the Holy Land, his ship struck a sandbank on the island of Cyprus. After a careful examination, it was found that the sand had knocked off a considerable portion of the keel, dislocating the ship's timbers and rendering it unseaworthy; and the mariners advised Louis to leave it and go into another ship. The knights joined their entreaties to those of the seamen, and this was the king's reply: “Then the king said to the mariners: ‘I ask you, on your fealty, whether if the ship were yours, and freighted with your own merchandise,

you would leave her? And they all replied together, 'No,' for they liked better to put their bodies in peril of drowning rather than to buy a new ship at a cost of 4,000 livres and more. 'And why do you then advise me to leave the ship?' 'Because,' said they, 'the stakes are not equal. For neither gold nor silver can be set against your person and the persons of your wife and children who are here; therefore we advise you not to put yourself or them in jeopardy.' Then the king said to them: 'Lords, I have heard your opinion and that of my people, and now I will tell you mine, which is this: If I leave the ship, there are in her five hundred people, and more, who will land in this isle of Cyprus, for fear of peril to their bodies—since there is none that does not love his life as much as I love mine—and these, peradventure, will never return to their own land. Therefore I like better to place my own person, and my wife and my children, in God's hands than to do this harm to the many people who are here.' "

The thought ever uppermost in his mind was not of conquest, gain or glory, but the welfare of his beloved people: "The great love that he bore to his people," says the seneschal, in the opening chapters of his memoirs, "appeared in what he said during a very sore sickness that he had at Fontainebleau, unto my Lord Louis, his eldest son: 'Fair son,' he said, 'I pray thee to make thyself beloved of the people of thy kingdom; for truly I would rather that a Scot should come out of Scotland and govern the people well and equitably than that thou shouldst govern them ill in the sight of all men.' "

It was the king's wont to wash the feet of a number of poor people on Holy Thursday, in imitation of Christ washing the feet of His Apostles, and on one occasion he inquired whether De Joinville did the like. The honest knight very bluntly replied that he did not, for he considered the practice rather unseemly. Louis closed the incident by remarking very aptly and drily that he would scarcely expect a creature to consider beneath him what the Almighty God Himself did not disdain to do. His love for his people did not stop at merely wishing them well, or washing their feet. He showed it in a truly

practical manner, by heaping benefits upon them to the full extent of his power. Anent this matter, De Joinville writes thus: "From the time of his childhood, the king had pity on the poor and suffering; and the custom was that wherever the king went, six score poor persons were fed every day in his house with bread and wine, and meat or fish. In Lent and Advent the number of the poor was increased; and oftentimes it happened that the king served them, and set their food before them, and carved the meat before them, and gave them money with his own hand at their departing. Particularly at the great vigils, before the solemn festivals, he served the poor in all matters as aforesaid, before he himself either ate or drank. Besides all this, he had every day to dine or sup near him old and broken men, and caused them to be fed with the same meats of which he himself partook; and when they had eaten, they took away a certain sum of money.

"Besides all this, the king gave day by day, large alms to the poor religious, to the poor in hospitals, to the poor sick and to poor communities; also to poor gentlemen and ladies and girls, and to fallen women, and to poor widows, and to women who were lying in, and to poor workmen who, through age or sickness, could no longer work at their crafts; so that it would hardly be possible to number his alms. Therefore may it well be said that he was more fortunate than Titus, the Emperor of Rome, of whom old writings tell us that he was sad and discomforted for any day on which he had not been able to confer a benefit."

Civil Service Reform, or the merit system, is one of the crying demands of our age and country; and to listen to the glib talk of our modern political reformers, one might almost be tempted to consider it, like most other good things that have come to us, as an altogether new discovery. But happily in this, as in so many other respects, the democratic French king of the Middle Ages was a pioneer, and may well serve as a model for our present day advocates of the merit system. What appealed to Louis was not the man's rank or station in life but his character and personal worth, and he invariably selected



for positions of trust the men who were noted, not for mere nobility of birth, but rather for their uprightness and efficiency. Thus, when the constableness of France became vacant he went outside his own realm to secure the services of Giles Le Brun, solely because he considered him the man best fitted for that office. One of his closest companions and most trusted counsellors was the commoner, Robert of Sorbon, whom Louis highly esteemed for his judgment, learning and character. When he ascended the throne, he found corruption rampant in the city of Paris. The provostship of the capital, like the imperial dignity in the days of Rome's decadence, was sold to the highest bidder, and the successful candidate generally reimbursed himself by accepting bribes and hush-money. As a result, there was little or no justice to be had from the municipal administration without a liberal use of gold. The friends and relatives and supporters of the provost were protected and upheld in wrong-doing; the provost's enemies, and all who failed to supply the cash, ignored. As the chronicler remarks: "The poor were greatly downtrodden; nor could they obtain justice against the rich because of the great presents and gifts that the latter made to the provosts."

As soon as Louis became acquainted with this state of affairs, he set about to remedy it by forbidding the sale of the office, increasing the provost's salary so that he might have no reasonable excuse for accepting largesses, and then causing an enquiry to be made throughout the whole kingdom "to find men who would execute good and strict justice, and not spare the rich any more than the poor." His search was rewarded by the discovery of Stephen Boileau, a man of stern, unbending principle, of exceptional ability and firmness, absolutely just and fearless—a man "who so maintained and upheld the office of provost that no malefactor, nor thief, nor murderer, dared remain in Paris, seeing that if he did, he was soon hung or exterminated; neither parentage, nor lineage, nor gold, nor silver, could save him."

Were more needed, we could give other instances in abundance to support our claim; but we feel that more than

enough has already been said to prove the point in question. The facts speak for themselves: they are most eloquent witnesses to the justice of our contention that a man may be a king and yet a genuine democrat. They show conclusively enough that, just as in a democracy we may find some, both governors and governed, who are anything but democratic at heart, so it is possible to find, now and then, as in the case of Louis the Ninth, a thorough-going democrat seated even upon a kingly throne.

JOHN E. GRAHAM.

## ADDISON AND THE MODERN ESSAY.<sup>1</sup>

---

### I.

If, lifted on the wings of imagination, we should transport ourselves in space some 3,000 miles and in time some 200 years, and go back to the London of the days of Good Queen Anne, we should find it, not perhaps in essentials, but certainly in many outward aspects, very different from the London of to-day. Accustomed as we are to the bignesses of the twentieth century, we should doubtless consider it, from the point of view both of area and of population, somewhat insignificant in comparison with the immense city with which we are now acquainted, and which is by no means flattered when it is called the Modern Babylon. At the same time, however, we should find the London of the early eighteenth century seething with activity, busy and bustling with varied forms of life, full of its own importance, and, with its three-quarters of a million of inhabitants, well on its way to be the metropolis of the greatest empire that the world has ever seen.

We should, indeed, be made painfully aware of many drawbacks. The streets were narrow, ill-paved, and ill-lighted, and were infested by gangs of desperadoes and bullies, who made personal violence a practice and not infrequently plied highway robbery as a trade. Sanitation, in the modern sense, was not understood, and great heaps of filth lay about in exposed situations. To avoid surroundings so noisome the citizens did their travelling as much as possible on the River Thames, which, with its fleet of tilt-boats and barges, still remained the great thoroughfare for transportation of passengers and

<sup>1</sup>This article and its continuation, which will appear in the next number of the *Bulletin*, consist, in substance, of a lecture delivered October 19, 1911, in the series of public lectures organized by the administration of the Catholic University of America.

goods. Smarting from the recent application of Jeremy Collier's lash,<sup>2</sup> the stage wore a semblance of decency; but in society an aftermath of the scandalously profligate period of the Restoration and of the license of the court of Charles II. was clearly discernible in manners that were decidedly coarse and in morals that were somewhat lax. Superstition was widespread. Drunkenness, boxing, and duelling were common. Cock-fighting and the baiting of badger, bull, and bear were pursued with zest. Card-playing and lotteries and rash speculation had votaries in every walk of life. Relying on the never-failing asset of human credulity, the beauty-doctor and the quack vendor of nostrums and cure-alls flourished in the land. Not much fault on the score of aesthetics could be found with the dress in vogue among gentlemen: whether the same could be said of the attire of the ladies is at least open to question. In those distant days Englishmen of position wore—among other things—knee-breeches and full-bottomed wigs, and Englishwomen of quality went about arrayed in monstrously hooped petticoats and tricked out with party patches dotted here and there on their foreheads and on their painted and powdered cheeks. A busy, fussy, and, especially among the upper classes, a somewhat frivolous life was led.

There were, naturally, many topics of interest to engage the attention of those dwellers in London town; but the one outstanding subject that never seemed to pall was the war. In the spring of the year of grace 1709—the date to which our attention is to be first particularly directed—the War of the Spanish Succession had for seven years been waged with varying fortune on sea and land—in Spain, in Portugal, in France, in the Netherlands, in Bavaria, in Sardinia, in Minorca, in Italy, in Savoy. The student of the various phases of that memorable struggle has his attention held at every turn by famous historical characters—Prince Eugene and the Earl of Peterborough; Sir George Rooke, Sir Cloudesley Shovel, and

<sup>2</sup> Jeremy Collier's *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* was published in 1698, and his *Dissuasive from the Play-house, in a Letter to a Person of Quality*, in 1703.



the Count de Toulouse; Marshal Berwick and Marshal Boufflers; Villars and Jean Cavalier; Stanhope and Staremburg; Tallard and Vauban and Vendôme. The great captain, who never fought a battle that he did not win and never laid siege to a walled city that he did not take, who paralyzed the marshals and set at nought the engineers of the grand monarch, was in 1709 still lord of the ascendant. Handsome, courteous, debonair, diplomatic, ambitious of power, greedy of pelf, sordid indeed, if not corrupt, in money matters, John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, Prince of Mindelheim in the Holy Roman Empire, captain-general of the English troops at home and abroad, and master-general of the ordnance, was still actively engaged in that series of military manoeuvres which made all Europe thrill, which saved Vienna, which impoverished France, which forced Louis XIV. to sue in vain for peace, and caused French mothers to hush their wailing infants to sleep by invoking the dread name of Malbrook. This nonpareil commander had already won undying fame by his great victories of Blenheim,<sup>3</sup> Ramillies,<sup>4</sup> and Oudenarde,<sup>5</sup> and in the September of this year his glory was still further to be increased, although at a terrible cost of lives, on the murderous field of Maplaquet.<sup>6</sup> A Tory politician, who from many mixed motives, dominant among which was Self, had adopted a Whig policy, Marlborough was maintained in the proud and profitable position of commander-in-chief of the armies of the Grand Alliance by the intrigues of his clever, scheming, beautiful, shrewish wife, and by the Whig faction which then ruled, and for a year or so longer was to continue to rule, the roast in England.

With this war and with this commander, and with the Whig party which supported both, are inextricably intertwined the names of Joseph Addison and Richard Steele. Addison had obtained his first start in life from the Whigs, and he got his second chance by celebrating the victory of Blenheim in a poem, made to order, called *The Campaign* (December, 1704),

<sup>3</sup> August 13, 1704.

<sup>6</sup> July 11, 1708.

<sup>4</sup> May 23, 1706.

<sup>5</sup> September 11, 1709.

in which, in a simile that has been famous for two centuries, he likened Marlborough to an angel that rides in the whirlwind and directs the storm. As soon as he had penned that image his fortune was made, for in England this was the age of gold for literary men. He was in turn appointed a Commissioner of Appeal in Excise (1704), Under-Secretary of State (1706), Secretary to Lord Halifax on a mission to the Elector of Hanover (1707), member of Parliament (1708), Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and keeper of the records in Dublin Castle (1709), Secretary to the lords justices (1714), Chief Secretary for Ireland a second time (1714), a Commissioner of Trade and Plantations (1716), and finally a principal Secretary of State (1717), retiring from the last-mentioned office with a pension of £1,500 a year (1718). Some of his prose writings, too, are directly concerned with the war and with the policy that dictated its continuance. Such are his pamphlet, *The Present State of the War, and the Necessity of an Augmentation* (1707), his paper the *Whig Examiner* (1710), and his pamphlet *The Trial and Conviction of Count Tariff* (1713). In his opera of *Rosamond* (1707) he paid compliments to Marlborough in some rather indifferent lyrical verse. Nor must it be forgotten that his first contribution to the *Tatler* is linked up with the war in that quietly and quaintly humorous style which was to be the distinctive feature of so many of his future essays.

Steele was almost a life-long friend of Addison's. They were of the same age, they were boys together at the Charterhouse School, they were at Oxford together, and their names are indissolubly and forever associated together with the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the *Guardian*. A more pronounced and ardent and belligerent Whig even than Addison, Steele owed practically all the success that he attained in public life to his Whig connection. He disappeared from the University in 1694 without taking a degree, and entered the army as a private soldier in the Life Guards. Luckily he dedicated his poem, *The Procession*, written on the death of Queen Mary, to Lord Cutts, Colonel of the Coldstream Guards, and through

the influence of that intrepid soldier he rose from the ranks to a commission, and was finally gazetted captain in Lord Lucas's regiment of fusiliers. It is doubtful if he saw any active service: somehow, despite the duel in which he participated as principal, we do not seem naturally to associate Steele with the idea of a fighting man. Recommended by Addison to the patronage of Lords Halifax and Sunderland, leaders of the Whigs, Steele was appointed in 1706 Gentleman Waiter to his royal highness, Prince George of Denmark, consort of Queen Anne; in the following year he received the then important post of Gazetteer or editor of the *London Gazette*; and in 1710 he was made commissioner of stamps. In common with Addison he suffered for his principles during the ascendancy of the Tories from 1710 to 1714; but when George I. came to the throne Steele was made a justice of the peace, deputy-lieutenant of Middlesex, and surveyor of the royal stables; he received the lucrative post of patentee of Drury Lane theatre and Governor of the Royal Company of Comedians; he was made a knight; and, on the suppression of the Jacobite rebellion of 1715, he was appointed a commissioner of forfeited Scotch estates. Many of his writings are fiercely partisan. When Marlborough was dismissed on December 31, 1711, Steele wrote *An Englishman's Thanks to the Duke of Marlborough*; even in the pages of the professedly non-political *Guardian* he could not entirely refrain from political controversy; and two of his publications, *The Englishman* and *The Crisis*, were, in the heyday of his political opponents, officially declared to be "scandalous and seditious libels highly reflecting upon her Majesty, upon the nobility, clergy, gentry, and universities of this kingdom," and by formal vote of 245 to 152 their author was, on March 12, 1714, expelled from membership of the House of Commons.

From active politicians and busy men of affairs of the type of Addison and Steele one would not ordinarily be inclined to expect any startling new departure in literature; and yet it was precisely with these two men that there originated a class of publication—the Periodical Essay—which both had in itself

the charm of novelty and was destined profoundly to influence literary form and output from their own day to ours not only in all English-speaking countries but also in nearly every nation of Europe.

Under the later Stuarts the newspaper press in England was practically in its infancy. If a man wished to work up public opinion on any question of the day, he wrote a pamphlet. This was read and discussed in coffee-houses, and generally provoked one or more pamphlets in reply. During the period of the Civil War (1642-1651) there had been various ephemeral newspapers, generally called *Mercuries*, which gave their readers some items of news combined with attacks on the opposite party; but, on the whole, political controversy was carried on by means of pamphlets, published separately and for a specific purpose. After the Restoration (1660) the newspaper grew gradually in importance. Sir Roger L'Estrange, himself a noted pamphleteer, started in 1663 two weekly papers, the *News* and the *Public Intelligencer*, which he "published for the satisfaction and information of the people." These were followed in 1665 by the *Oxford Gazette*, which became in the following year the *London Gazette*, and under the latter title has had a continuous existence ever since. The *Gazette*, then as now, contained little but paragraphs of news and official notices; and when men's minds were violently agitated, as, for example, during the wild excitement caused by the so-called Popish Plot of 1679-80, the pamphlet remained the favorite form of controversy. The pamphlet, in fact, was then to a large extent what a leading article or editorial in an influential newspaper, or what a letter from a public man to the *London Times*, is to-day. With the disappearance of the system of press licensing in 1695 more and more newspapers were established, and finally, in 1702, three days after the accession of Queen Anne, the first daily newspaper, the *Daily Courant*, appeared. This journal had distinct limitations, for the editor expressed his intention of relating only matters of fact and of avoiding comment or conjecture, so that the domain of the pamphlet was as yet by no means usurped. Some few years later, for ex-



ample, Swift published, in *The Conduct of the Allies* (1711), *The Barrier Treaty* (1712), and *The Public Spirit of the Whigs* (1714), three of the finest and most convincing pamphlets of which we have record; he used the pamphlet in 1724 with deadly effect in his celebrated *Drapier Letters* written against the acceptance of Wood's halfpence by the people of Ireland; and far on into the century the pamphlet continued to be a weapon ever ready to hand for politicians of all parties.

A great advance, however, towards a different order of things, politically and otherwise, that is, towards periodicity as against uncertainty in publication, was made in 1704 when Daniel Defoe, then in prison for the political offence of publishing his own pamphlet, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, started his *Review*. It was entitled *A Review of the Affairs of France and of all Europe as influenced by that Nation*. Its principal topics were politics, news, and trade, but there was a lighter section intended to "bring people to read with delight." The title of this appendix was *Mercure Scandale: or Advice from the Scandalous Club*. Its purpose was thus stated by the editor: "After our serious matters we shall, at the end of every paper, present you with a little diversion, as anything occurs to make the world merry; and whether friend or foe, one party or another, if anything happens so scandalous as to require an open reproof, the world will meet with it there." The topics of the Scandal Club were questions in divinity, morals, war, language, poetry, love, marriage, and so forth, and it is obvious that the introduction of this Club and of the subjects it discussed approximates very closely to the model subsequently adopted in the *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the *Guardian*. We may, I think, justly go farther and say that it furnished very useful hints. Defoe's *Review*, begun on February 19, 1704, lasted for over nine years, until June 11, 1713, and thus it was not only the predecessor but was also the contemporary of the three more famous publications. It came out at first once, then twice, and finally thrice a week, reverting to a bi-weekly publication for the last ten months of its existence on account of the imposition of the halfpenny tax on newspapers and periodicals in August, 1712. Containing as it did political criticism as well as news,

it may be taken to be the direct ancestor of all the political magazines and reviews that have since appeared.

Among other predecessors of the Steele-Addison papers were John Dunton's *Athenian Mercury*, established in 1690, which contained questions to the editor on every variety of subject, with suitable answers—a modest forerunner in fact of the modern *Notes and Queries*; and the *British Apollo* (1708-11), which was of the same order as the *Athenian Mercury*, but devoted considerable space to verse and other occasional contributions and to the decision of wagers on cards and other bets.

It has been already stated that Steele was made official gazetteer in 1707. He was well off in the matter of income, which from all sources was at that date £1,025 a year; but he was notoriously extravagant and fond of display, and in consequence he was often deep in debt, and knew only too well the touch of the bailiff's hand and the inside of the sponging-house. Accordingly, he felt the necessity of strengthening his resources, and, being gifted in a marked degree with the journalistic instinct, he bethought himself of starting a paper to come out three times a week, and to be sold at one penny per number. There can scarcely be a doubt that his position as gazetteer and the fact that in that capacity he had early official knowledge of happenings abroad and especially in connection with the war, which was then in all men's minds and on all men's tongues, was one of the determining causes of this decision; another, I feel certain, was the comparative success of Defoe's *Review*; but the great factor was the man's innate tendency to publish, spurred as it was by the sharp and pressing need of making more money. Thus, on Tuesday, April 12, 1709, the *Tatler* came into being. The first four numbers were given away free, but after that the price was enforced. It is amusing to read in the first issue the earnest appeals of Steele for the payment of the penny. He bluffed, too, in the most approved modern journalistic style, about the great charges for his materials and about the staff of correspondents he had arranged to maintain in all parts of the world. The form of

the new paper was a single folio sheet of two pages. It purported to be conducted by Isaac Bickerstaff, Esq., a name which had quite recently been made famous by Swift in his exquisite fooling with Partridge, the astrologer and almanac maker. The motto from Juvenal,<sup>7</sup>

Quicquid agunt Homines nostri Farrago Libelli,

Whate'er men do, or say, or think, or dream,  
Our motley Paper seizes for its Theme,

sufficiently indicates the miscellaneous nature of the contents.

The introduction is quite specific as to the scope and intentions of the *Tatler*. The editor says:—

“Tho’ the other Papers which are printed for the Use of the good People of England have certainly very wholesom Effects, and are laudable in their particular Kinds, they do not seem to come up to the main Design of such Narrations, which, I humbly presume, should be principally intended for the Use of Politick Persons, who are so publick-spirited as to neglect their own Affairs to look into Transactions of State. Now these Gentlemen, for the most Part, being Persons of strong Zeal and weak Intellects, It is both a Charitable and Necessary work to offer something, whereby such worthy and well-affected Members of the Commonwealth may be instructed, after their Reading, WHAT TO THINK: Which shall be the End and Purpose of this my Paper.”

This idea was never forgotten or lost sight of throughout the *Tatler* and its successors.

Steele came to his task equipped with some literary reputation based on a treatise called *The Christian Hero*, and on three comedies of fair merit; with an education which had been by no means finished, but which nevertheless counted for something; and with a varied and extensive knowledge of taverns, clubs, and coffee-houses, of men and women, and of life

<sup>7</sup> Sat. i., 85, 86. The lines in full run thus:—

Quicquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,  
Gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est.

about town. His original idea was to give news in addition to his jocose or serious lucubrations, but as time went on the news became of less and less importance and more and more emphasis was laid on the Essay.

The merit of the conception and starting of the *Tatler* is entirely Steele's. Addison was then in Ireland, and it was only when he saw a criticism which he had himself communicated to Steele reproduced in the sixth number of the paper that he concluded that Isaac Bickerstaff was no other than his old friend. The idea of the paper appealed to Addison, and he at once offered his services. His first acknowledged contribution appeared in No. 18 of the *Tatler* on Saturday, May 21, 1709, and runs, in part, as follows. He is dealing with manufacturers of news:—

“The Case of these Gentlemen is, I think, more hard than that of the Soldiers, considering that they have taken more Towns, and fought more Battles. They have been upon Parlies and Skirmishes, when our Armies have been still; and given the General Assault to many a Place, when the Besiegers were quiet in their Trenches. They have made us Masters of several strong Towns many weeks before our Generals could do it; and compleated Victories, when our greatest Captains have been glad to come off with a drawn Battle. Where Prince *Eugene* has slain his Thousands, *Boyer*<sup>8</sup> has slain his Ten Thousands. This Gentleman can indeed be never enough commended for his Courage and Intrepidity during this whole War: He has laid about him with an inexpressible Fury, and, like the offended *Marius* of ancient *Rome*, made such Havock among his Countrymen, as must be the Work of two or three Ages to repair. It must be confessed the Redoubted M<sup>r</sup>. *Buckley*<sup>9</sup> has shed as much Blood as the former; but I cannot forbear saying, (and I hope it will not look like Envy) that we regard our Brother *Buckley* as a kind of *Drawcansir*, who spares neither Friend or Foe, but generally kills as many of his own Side as the Enemy's. It is impossible for this ingenious sort of Men to subsist after a Peace: every one re-

<sup>8</sup> Of the *Post-Boy*.

<sup>9</sup> Of the *Daily Courant*.



members the Shifts they were driven to in the Reign of King Charles the Second, when they could not furnish out a single Paper of News, without lighting up a Comet in Germany, or a Fire in Moscow. There scarce appeared a Letter without a Paragraph on an Earthquake. Prodigies were grown so familiar, that they had lost their Name, as a great Poet of that Age has it. I remember Mr. *Dyer*,<sup>10</sup> who is justly looked upon by all the Fox-Hunters in the Nation as the greatest Statesman our Country has produced, was particularly famous for dealing in Whales; insomuch that in five Months Time (for I had the Curiosity to examine his Letters on that Occasion) he brought three into the mouth of the River Thames, besides two Porpusses and a Sturgeon. The judicious and wary Mr. Ichabod *Dawks*<sup>11</sup> hath all along been the Rival of this great Writer, and got himself a Reputation from Plagues and Famines: by which, in those Days, he destroyed as great Multitudes as he has lately done by the Sword. In every Dearth of News, Grand Cairo was sure to be unpeopled."

Thereafter Addison's contributions were fairly frequent. Of 271 *Tatlers* Steele wrote about 188, Addison 42, and they were jointly responsible for 36. Other contributors were Swift, Congreve, Harrison, and Ambrose Philips.

Addison brought to the new undertaking a mind stored with knowledge, which was in turn the fruit of long study, of much reading, of travel, and of keen observation; he was also, as appeared from the outset, gifted with a sly, pervasive, and captivating humour, which in its own kind has never been equalled, not to say surpassed; he had a certain dignity and poise; he was master of a fluent and easy style; and, above all, he was sincerely animated with a love of the beautiful, the good, and the true. What Addison's accession to the *Tatler* meant to literature and morals it has been the delight of successive generations of critics to dwell upon. He had as yet done nothing that was really great, but, in the words of Macaulay, "the time had come when he was to prove himself a man

<sup>10</sup> Of *Dyer's Letter*.

<sup>11</sup> Of *Dawks's Letter*.

of genius, and to enrich our literature with compositions which will live as long as the English language." <sup>12</sup>

Steele, ever generous, bore eloquent testimony to the value of the help of his friend. "I fared," he said, "like a distressed prince who calls in a powerful neighbour to his aid: I was undone by my Auxiliary; when I had once called him in I could not subsist without dependence on him." Elsewhere he says: "The paper was advanced indeed. It was raised to a greater thing than I intended it." Steele, it is true, herein belittled himself in order to magnify his friend, and although we love and admire him for doing it, and would like to regard his expressions as the hyperbole of devotion and esteem, it must be confessed that there is a solid foundation of fact for his statement. Despite many personal faults and lapses from the straight path, Steele was essentially a moralist, if not a preacher, and he had a strong moral purpose in the *Tatler*; but it is probable that his scheme of reform was not on such a high plane as that to which, by his association with Addison, he was ultimately led. To publish items of foreign and domestic news, to give accounts of plays and players, to draw attention to the pulpit performances of noted preachers, to descant on the gossip of clubdom regarding the classics of old and the latest literary ventures, to pay compliments to women on their beauty or dress, to poke gentle fun at fashionable foibles, to condemn duelling, to pillory sharpers and ridicule bores, was about the ambit of Steele's aim, and in attaining that aim there was still ample opportunity for him, in his own telling phrase, to teach his readers what to think. But the loftier tone of Addison and his more subtle humour gradually infected his editor, and the result was that, like one actor responding to another more powerful actor on the stage, Steele played up to the pitch and standard set by his colleague. By the finished and careful papers sent in by Addison, Steele was stimulated to a higher ambition, and, as he himself tells us, to an elegance, a purity, and a correctness to which he had not at first aspired.

Thus between these two minds there was produced a new spe-



<sup>12</sup> Essay on *The Life and Writings of Addison* (July, 1843).

cies of writing in the Periodical Essay. As Mr. Austin Dobson says: "It was when the scholarly secretary to Lord Wharton commenced to print . . . the delightful La Bruyère-like studies of Tom Folio and Ned Softly and the Political Upholsterer, the *Adventures of a Shilling*, and the Rabelaisian *Frozen Voices*, that a new thing began to be born which was the Essay of Addison and Steele."<sup>13</sup> Under this benign influence Steele produced those affecting domestic scenes in which he was so expert, and thus in one direction anticipated the function of the Novel that was in due course to come. If Steele did much for Addison by affording him the opportunity of showing the latent powers that he possessed, Addison repaid the obligation by bringing out from Steele the best that was in him, and by giving to his inventive genius a bent in the direction of higher and nobler things than he had hitherto dreamt of. This was plainly seen in the next venture in which the friends joined.

(To be continued.)

P. J. LENNOX.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

<sup>13</sup> Article "The Eighteenth Century," in *Chambers's Cyclopaedia of English Literature*, Vol. II., p. 3.

## JOHN XXII AND THE BEATIFIC VISION

---

### A CONTRIBUTION TO DOMINICAN THEOLOGICAL HISTORY.

During all his long and eventful life John XXII had been a warm and admiring friend of the Order of St. Dominic. From its friars he had received his early education in his native town of Cahors, Gascony. Though raised in after years to the bishopric of Fréjus (1300), later transferred to the See of Avignon (1310), and finally elevated to the Pontifical Throne, August 7, 1316, he did not forget his old-time friendship, or lose the memory of the many favors he had received at their hands. Possibly, too, his election to the chair of Peter in the Dominican Monastery of Lyons may have given an additional strength to the already strong chain of friendship that bound him to the order. Like his predecessor, Clement V, who during his pontificate lived as a guest in the Dominican Monastery of that city, John chose Avignon as his place of permanent residence. It was he who raised the great Thomas Aquinas to the honor of the Altar; and so ardent was his admiration for the learned and saintly Dominican, that he preached three sermons during the ceremonies of the canonization, extending from the 14th to the 18th of July, 1323, (in one of which he declared that Thomas had performed as many miracles as he had written articles <sup>1</sup>), and celebrated, at the end, the first Mass ever offered in honor of the saint.

At the time of John's accession to the Papal Throne the Order of Preachers was in the zenith of its power and glory; strong in the vast numbers of its subjects, stronger still in their zeal, learning and eloquence. From the beginning it had been placed under the immediate jurisdiction and protection of the Sovereign Pontiff; and consecrated to the defence of the faith

<sup>1</sup> Percin, *Monumenta Conventus Tolosani*, p. 229; Frigerio, *Vita di San Tomaso*, Lib. I, C. VII, p. 44.



and the Church it constituted in the hands of the Successors of Peter a power to be reckoned with. For one hundred years successive Popes had not hesitated to call on its friars to undertake the most difficult and perilous missions. This Gascon Pontiff, a learned man himself, a keen judge of men, an astute statesman, fully abreast of his times,<sup>2</sup> was quick to see that he, too, might find a tower of strength in these same friars. History told him of their courage and faithfulness in the execution of the charges confided to them by his predecessors; and he was not slow in exacting the same tribute for himself, employing them in every capacity and in every country to spread the faith, to uphold the cause of religion, to stem the turmoil of the troublous times in which his pontificate was thrown.

They were his arm of strength in putting down the turbulent Fraticelli, then disturbing the peace of the world; they were sent as papal envoys to restore harmony between warring potentates; they were employed to bring the excommunicated Visconti of Milan into subjection to the Church and to calm anarchical uprisings in different parts of the Italian peninsula; they fulminated John's anathemas against the powerful Louis of Bavaria. Though because of their faithfulness in executing the papal commands laid upon them they had often to undergo bitter persecution, to suffer the loss of their houses, exile or even imprisonment, few were found wanting in their duty; and if at times some hesitated in the face of perils, their Masters General were there to enforce literal obedience to the orders of the Head of the Church.

The stress of putting down revolt against the Holy See and upholding the politico-ecclesiastical interests of the Papacy did not consume all the energies of John's active mind. One of the most apostolical of the Popes who have ruled over the destinies of the Church, he kept a watchful eye on the advancement of the spiritual interests of the faithful and did much for

<sup>2</sup> John's voluminous correspondence shows how closely he followed the political and religious events of the world in his day; how he sought in every way to further the interests both spiritual and temporal of the Church.

the conversion of heathen nations. No Pontiff ever had more at heart the missions of the far East. From the earliest days of their existence the Friars Preachers had penetrated all along the Barbary coasts of Africa, into Egypt, India, Greece, Palestine, Persia, Syria, Armenia, China, the Steppes of Russia, erecting monasteries or setting up missionary outposts of their order in many of the countries under the sway of the Tartar and the Mussulman.<sup>3</sup> One of the chief glories of the Avignon Papacy is its untiring efforts to bring the unbelievers of the Orient into the one fold of the true faith. John XXII took these missionaries and their missions under his especial protection, giving them his heartiest support. In 1318, we find him establishing at one time a whole ecclesiastical province with an archbishop and six bishops, and appointing Dominicans to all the seven new dioceses.<sup>4</sup> On another occasion, 1328, he writes the Fathers assembled in the General Chapter in Toulouse, France, calling for fifty or more religious to be sent to labor on the missions in the Orient. "Ardently desirous," he says, "of seeing the divine ministry, already flourishing among many infidel nations, become more and more efficient in the propagation of the true faith, and seeking, as a means of furthering this noble purpose, to increase the number of evangelical laborers among those peoples, we have, after mature deliberation, resolved to appeal to you assembled in chapter. For the Order of Preachers, through the blessing of God, is as a firmament bristling with stars; it abounds in religious men of conspicuous virtue. Our will and wish are, therefore, that you designate at least fifty of your brethren for that field of labor. We wish further that all those so chosen should be priests, that only those who voluntarily offer themselves for those missions should be selected and that that they should be neither too young nor too old, men of grave character, truly religious men, as only this kind are suited for such apostolic work. Those selected will be sent to the Orient and dispersed among the

<sup>3</sup> For the history of these missions see Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de L'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, Vols. 2 and 3, *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> *Bull. Ord. Praed.*, Vol. 2, p. 137; Mortier, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 509 et seq.

different monasteries of your order in those parts, as the needs of the missions may demand.”<sup>5</sup>

When, after the Chapter of Toulouse, Barnabas of Vercelli, the Master General of the Order, in search of recruits for the missions of the East, sent notice of the Holy Father's letter broadcast through the various provinces of the order, the numbers of Friars Preachers applying for, nay begging, the privilege of laboring for the conversion of the infidel were so great, that it became necessary to restrain their ardor. Had not their zeal been repressed within due bounds, whole provinces had been made desolate. The news of this unwonted outpouring of devotion for the salvation of souls, when it reached the ears of John, caused him to exclaim: “Verily, these friars were made to shine and to light up the Church of God.”<sup>6</sup>

No less keen and beneficent was the interest of the second of the Avignon Popes in the historic Dominican mission in Armenia which resulted in nearly the entire conversion of the schismatic Basilian monks of that country, and their eventual affiliation with the Order of St. Dominic.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, if the space of this article permitted, much interesting and edifying matter might be written on this and other missions under the charge of the Fathers in the far East during the years of John's pontificate. He aided them in every possible way, and left no stone unturned in order to further the cause of religion in those parts.

But this long-standing friendship was destined to receive a rude shock; and the years from 1330 or 1331 until the death of John XXII, December 4, 1334, form a period of uncommon interest in the history of the Dominican Order. About the year 1330, disturbing reports began to be circulated abroad through the intellectual centers of Europe that the Pope was teaching or favoring a strange and erroneous doctrine concerning the state of the souls of the just after death. It was said he

<sup>5</sup> *Encl. Ord. Praed.*, vol. 2, p. 178; Reichert, *Acta Capit.*, vol. 2, 178; Mortier, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 27 et seq.

<sup>6</sup> Fontana, *Monumenta Domin.*, p. 186.

<sup>7</sup> Mortier, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 31 et seq.

held that souls departing this life and needing not to pass through the cleansing fires of purgatory, and those that had already been so purified, would not be permitted to cross the threshold of heaven, or admitted to the beatific vision, before the day of the final judgment; that before then they would enjoy, it is true, some foretaste of the heavenly bliss, some fruit of their merits, but not until after the resurrection and the re-union of body and soul would they receive the full measure of the supernatural reward which consists in what the apostle calls the full and direct vision of God. At first there were only vague, disquieting rumors, but by the end of 1331 the theological world was rent by the certainty that the Head of the Church was really preaching against a Catholic teaching which had long been considered as practically of faith divine, the denial of which was tantamount to heresy. On November 1, of that year, John preached before the assembled cardinals, prelates and theologians resident at the Papal Court, and numbers of the faithful, taking as his text: "*Mementote operum patrum vestrorum quae fecerunt in generationibus suis.*" During the course of his sermon, touching upon his favorite topic of the beatific vision, he gave a thinly veiled expression of his personal opinion by declaring that the souls of the just, before the general judgment, are under the altar of God, that is to say, under the protection of the glorified humanity of Christ, and enjoying the happiness of its presence. After the day of judgment, they will be placed on the altar of God, or will be admitted to the presence of His divinity, and that of the Blessed Trinity in whose direct vision man's full and complete happiness consists.

Growing bolder, it would seem, and determined plainly to speak out his mind on the subject, he preached again two weeks later, November 15, before the same distinguished audience. This time he took as his text: "*Gaudete in Domino semper*"; and laying aside all cover of metaphor and veil of mysticism, he declared himself openly in favor of the delay of the beatific vision. His words are: "I say that the souls of the faithful departed do not enjoy that perfect or face to face vision of God,



in which, according to St. Augustine (in *Psalm xc*, sermo II, No. 13), consists their full reward of justice; nor will they have that happiness until after the general judgment. When, and only when, the soul will be re-united to the body, will this perfect bliss come to man, coming to the whole man composed of body and soul, and perfecting his entire being." And, following out his opinion to its logical conclusion, in a discourse delivered, the eve of the Epiphany, January 5, 1332, on the words: "*Tolle puerum et matrem ejus*," John declared further, by way of corollary of his previous sermon, that souls departing this life in mortal sin are not forthwith sent to hell; that, just as the blessed will not be admitted to the intuitive presence of God until after the resurrection of the body, so also not until then will the condemned be consigned to the depths of their punishment. These three were the Pontiff's principal sermons on the beatific vision; yet in others, preached at a later date, he touches on the subject *obiter*, always manifesting a continuance of his belief in the doctrine he had taught in them. And, in 1333, he wrote a treatise in its defence: "*Queritur utrum anime sanctorum ab omnibus peccatis purgate videant divinam essentiam*." <sup>8</sup>

The news of such a doctrinal lapse on the part of the Church's Supreme Head, beginning at Avignon, rapidly spread over Christendom, everywhere causing consternation and arousing great indignation. The Catholic world was profoundly stirred.<sup>9</sup> Controversies waxed strong and vehement. Quite naturally, in Avignon, where the Papal Court resided, these were of a much less pronounced character. There, indeed, the new doctrine, possibly because of hopes of preferment, found a number of ardent supporters. On the other hand, fear of incurring papal disfavor caused its opponents to be less em-

<sup>8</sup> See Denifle and Chatelain on the sermons of John XXII, *Chartularium Univer. Par.*, vol. 2, p. 414, no. 970; Mortier, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 68-70; Baluze-Mansi, *Miscellanea*, 3, 349 et seq.

<sup>9</sup> Denifle, *op. cit.*, p. 414-15, no. 970; Mortier, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 69; *Contin. Guill. de Nangis*, Ed. Geraud, vol. 2, p. 127; Verlaque, *Jean XXII*, p. 198 et seq. (Paris, 1883). The first excitement gradually cooled down, but only to arise with redoubled bitterness in 1333 (Denifle, pp. 414-15).

phatic in their denunciations. Yet, even at the very foot of the pontifical throne, there was not wanting the strong voice of protest; for there also the old traditional doctrine, sanctified by the acceptance of ages, found able and courageous defenders. Among these the theologians of the Order of St. Dominic took decidedly a leading part.

It was not long before vigorous protests and rumors of angry excitement began to pour in upon the Pope from the four quarters of the globe. Alarmed at the storm he had stirred up, John XXII sought refuge behind the Scriptures and the Fathers, particularly St. Augustine. He maintained that he had not advanced the teaching advocated in his sermons as of his own making, but had taken it from the great Doctors of the Church, and from the Sacred Text itself; that he had preached simply as a private theologian, not as Head of the Church, defining a doctrine to be accepted as of faith; that, consequently, his opinion, being given as that of a private doctor, was subject to the judgment and decision of the Church to be approved or condemned, as it may be found true or false; that, furthermore, the question was open to discussion, and every theologian was free to accept and to advocate whichever side of the controversy he should judge to be the true one.<sup>10</sup> He did not, therefore, give any *ex cathedra* decision binding the consciences of the faithful. Theologians, as history shows, by no means accepted John's private tenets.

The Pontiff, however, was far from being as unbiased in his judgment and impartial in his actions as he fancied. Despite these declarations, as is shown by the difference of treatment accorded its supporters and adversaries, he continued to entertain a strong predilection for the opinion he had advanced. On the one hand, as a contemporary informs us, to support it was a sure passport to honors and preferment; while, on the other, to oppose it, whether by word of mouth or in writing, meant papal disfavor, or even punishment. For one it meant imprisonment.<sup>11</sup> Despite, too, the vehement protests

<sup>10</sup> Cfr. John's letters in Denifle, *op. cit.*, p. 415 et seq.; Mortier, *op. cit.* p. 169 et seq.

<sup>11</sup> Villani, *Istorie Fiorentine*, vol. 10, p. 392, ed. Milan, 1834.

that poured into Avignon, and the general dissatisfaction excited by his sermons, particularly those of November 15, 1331, and Jan. 5, 1332, he sought, for a time at least, to defend and to disseminate the doctrine they contained. At his command numerous copies of his second sermon were made, and a copy given to whosoever desired to see the Pope's side of the controversy. He also sent a copy of his treatise (*libellus*) to Queen Johanna of France, or rather to the Franciscan, Walter de Divione, to explain to her.<sup>12</sup>

The reports of the strong opposition to the new doctrine on the part of Phillip VI of France, the Christian ruler most favorably disposed to John XXII, and the faculty of the University of Paris seem to have been the cause of no little uneasiness to the Pontiff. Letters still in existence show a considerable correspondence on the subject between Avignon and the King.<sup>13</sup> In the latter part of 1333, Gerard Odonis or Eudes, minister general of the Minorites, and Arnold of Saint-Michael, a papal penitentiary and one of the few Dominicans who stood with John in this matter—possibly influenced by the many favors he had received at the hands of that Pope,—left Avignon on a mission of restoring harmony between England and Scotland, and on their way stopped in Paris to consult with Philip. While there the Franciscan general, availing himself of the opportunity, made an attempt to gain over the French monarch to the Pope's cause and to win adherents among the professors of the University. The attempt proved a complete failure. The Dominican, frightened by the tumult and scandal caused by Eudes' sermon, sought to appease the anger aroused by it and to excuse the Pontiff by showing the scriptural and patristic authorities on which he had based his opinion. So intense, however, was the feeling against the Minorite general, largely due, it would seem, to an impression that he and his companion had been sent to Paris for the express purpose of making propagandism for John XXII, and that the mission to England was only a pretence to justify

<sup>12</sup> Denifle, *op. cit.* p. 414, no. 970; 418, no. 974; 427, no. 979.

<sup>13</sup> Cfr. Letters of John XXII in Denifle *ut supra*.

their coming to Paris, that Philip declared he considered him a heretic, and that, unless he retracted his scandalous assertions, he would have him burned at the stake. He is also said to have made threats against John himself.<sup>14</sup> Feeling keenly the action of Philip and the University, John wrote the former, November 18, 1333, censuring him for his inordinate zeal before the question as to whether the beatific vision is granted to worthy souls immediately on their death, or is delayed until after the final judgment, should be decided by the Church. He also declared he had only advanced the opinion attributed to him as probable and supported by authorities both scriptural and patristic; admonished the King that the question is still, and must be, open to free discussion; informed him that Peter Roger, Archbishop of Rouen, had been commissioned, subject to the royal approval, to present his (John's) case and authorities before the theological faculty of the University; and requested that they be allowed full liberty of discussion.<sup>15</sup>

So few, indeed, were the exceptions, that it may be said the theologians of the Order of St. Dominic rose up as a body in favor of the time-honored, traditional Catholic teaching, boldly withstanding John's propositions. Neither fear of feeling the weight of papal displeasure, nor hope of reward, had any influence on the Friar Preacher, when there was question of an error against Catholic faith. He was the Pontiff's most pronounced and outspoken antagonist. The spectacle of an order, whose sons had braved every danger and with unflinching courage borne untold sufferings in defending the Holy See against Louis of Bavaria, now resisting with the same unyielding fortitude and fearless spirit the Roman Pontiff himself in his apparent efforts to propagate a doctrine they adjudged contrary to faith, elicited from that German monarch this splendid encomium: "Verily, the Order of Preachers is an order of truth."<sup>16</sup> And it was certainly inspiring to see an order,

<sup>14</sup> Denifle, 425, no. 976; 437, no. 984; Mortier, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-74; Natalis Alexander, *Hist. Eccles.*, vol. 7, p. 521; Villani, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

<sup>15</sup> Denifle, *op. cit.*, p. 426, no. 978; 427, no. 979.

<sup>16</sup> Taegio, *Chron. Ampliss.*, II, p. 118.



equally indifferent to favor and dishonor, to loss and gain, withstanding with all its might, in the interest of Catholic truth, a Pontiff who had been one of the best friends it had know in the more than a hundred years of its existence, who had shown it every favor and every mark of affection, for whom it entertained the deepest love and esteem, and to defend whom its brethren had hesitated in the face of no peril.

Among those of the order who were made to feel the anger of John XXII, we shall single out three:—1. Barnabas of Vercelli, then its Master General, as head and leader of a great host of opponents to the theory of the delay of the full and direct vision of God, had incurred the Pontiff's ill will. Barnabas, after having made a canonical visitation of his order in Spain, and presided over a General Chapter assembled in Victoria, had returned to Avignon, intending to go thence into Italy, possibly for the purpose of continuing his visitation in the provinces of the Italian peninsula. But he received positive orders from the Pope not to enter his native land. Apparently because impeded in the government of his order from Avignon and feeling deeply the fact that he was *persona non grata* at the Papal Court, he later sought and obtained from John permission to retire to Paris, where he died soon after, January 10, 1332. Though the meekest and most fatherly of men, he was fearless and unbending in his defence of the traditional doctrine.<sup>17</sup>

2. Durandus of Saint-Pourçain, at the time Bishop of Meaux, was one of the first to challenge John's propositions. Scarcely had the news of the Avignon sermons reached him, when he hotly entered the arena of controversy, writing a treatise on the state of the just souls after death, in which he vigorously attacked the doctrine they advanced. He widely disseminated his work, and sent a copy of it to the French king. Its author was soon in disfavor. Unfortunately for Durandus himself, in the heat of controversy some ill sounding

<sup>17</sup> *Chron. mag. Ord.*, p. 56, *Constitut. Ord. Praed.*, Romae, 1690; Fontana, *Monumenta Dom.*, p. 183; Mortier, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-72.

propositions found their way into an otherwise well-reasoned treatise. The reputation of the writer as an independent thinker, it would seem, suggested to the Pontiff the idea of subjecting the book to a searching examination, with a view of finding errors that might discredit it. So it happened. A commission of thirteen masters in theology, all, or most, of whom were favorably disposed to the new view, and among whom were the Franciscan and Dominican whom we have seen pleading the cause of the Pope at Paris, after much acrimonious discussion censured eleven of its propositions as savoring of heresy.<sup>18</sup>

3. Thomas Walleys, or Walleis, was an Englishman by birth, and a master of the Oxford University, of whose faculty he had long been an honored and illustrious member. He was a man of deep piety, a profound theologian, and possessed of a courage that amounted to heroism. Having come to Avignon, he became the leader there of the Friars Preachers in their heroic defence of the doctrine that the beatific vision is given to departed souls immediately that they are found worthy. He became the victim of expiation for his order.

January 3, 1333, Master Thomas preached in the Dominican church of Avignon to an audience composed of cardinals, bishops, priests, religious of every order, and the faithful. Despite the contrary opinion of some few writers, John XXII, it seems certain, was not present at the preaching of this discourse. Walleys vigorously attacked the Pontiff's opinion, and, in answer to those who had pretended the great Thomas Aquinas favored that doctrine, he took occasion to show that that saint, canonized by John himself, characterizes it as heretical. That men's souls were wrought to a high pitch on the subject is evident from the aggressive tone running all through the Englishman's discourse. However, if we are correctly to appreciate Thomas' method of speech, we must remember that shortly before other sermons, in which the rancor of heated controversy

<sup>18</sup> Denifle, p. 415, no. 970; 418, no. 975; 425, no. 976; Benedict XII, *Quaestiones de Visione beatifica*, Vat. Ms. 4006, fol. 225; Mortier, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

found a conspicuous part, had been preached in favor of the opposite view. It was a period, too, of direst confusion in affairs both political and religious. The atmosphere was literally palpitant with the scandal and unrest that had been caused by the Avignon sermons. The minds of theologians were stirred and their hearts aflame. The people were as a unit on the side of the defenders of the universal belief of the Church. It was, further, an age of outspoken, blunt language; an age when the faith was defended with all the energetic sincerity of a deep, living *credo*. A child of his time Thomas Walleys simply defended the teaching of the Church with the plain-spoken, brusque language of the period.

Walleys' sermon was preached on the third day of January; on the ninth of the same month seven of its propositions were censured by William of Monterotundo, a Minorite Inquisitor, as savoring of heresy; by the fourteenth of February he was confined in a prison of the Inquisition; and in September the same commission of thirteen who examined Durandus's work, condemned seven propositions of Walleys taken from his sermon and a vindication he had hurriedly written while in prison. The English Dominican's name is still to be seen on the inquisitorial account book. He has himself left us an idea of the treatment accorded him as a prisoner. Neither confinement nor harsh treatment could break his spirit, or cause him to relax one iota in the doctrine he had preached.<sup>19</sup>

John XXII had shown a far better spirit and much more of the wisdom of the skilled diplomat, had he been more moderate and conceded his opponents the full liberty of discussion he professed to allow to all. His repressive measures were productive of no good; nor was the imprudence of his actions slow in becoming manifest. The imprisonment of Walleys created an impression that was far from being favorable to the Pope. Indignation ran particularly high at the University of

<sup>19</sup> For information on Walleys see Denifle, p. 415, No. 970; 415-416, no. 971, and notes 3 and 4; pp. 416-418, nos. 972-75; Mortier, *op. cit.*, pp. 76 et seq.; Echard, *Scriptores Ord. Praed.*, vol. I, p. 599 gives copious extracts from Walleys' sermon.

Paris and at the Court of Philip VI. In vain did John, writing to the French monarch or his Queen consort try to create the impression that the English Dominican had been imprisoned, not because of his antagonism to the views advocated in the Avignon sermons, but on account of the heresies contained in his own sermons.<sup>20</sup> In order to appease the displeasure aroused by the incarceration of Master Thomas, the Pontiff finally acceded to public opinion so far as to transfer the prisoner to the Papal Palace during the month of October, 1333.<sup>21</sup> There, it is true, Walleys' position was bettered; yet, as he continued to be denied his liberty, the minds of men refused to be calmed.

Determined to bring matters to an issue, Philip VI called a meeting of the theological faculty of the University of Paris for the purpose of having them express their opinion on the subject in debate. Accordingly, on December 19, 1333, a commission of twenty-three masters in theology assembled in the royal palace under the presidency of Peter de la Palud, the Dominican patriarch of Jerusalem; and there in the presence of the Kings of France and Navarre, many bishops, priests, secular and regular, princes, and faithful, they unanimously declared their firm belief in the Catholic teaching, that the souls departed and freed from all stain of sin and debt due to sin enjoy the beatific or full and direct vision of God before the day of judgment. And on the second day of January, 1334, they and six other Masters who did not attend the first meeting, affixed their names to a profession of their faith wherein they declared that: "After the death of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, the souls of the faithful who have departed this life exempt from all purgatorial purification, or have been liberated therefrom, enjoy a perfect, beatifying, intuitive and immediate vision of the divine essence and the Most Holy Trinity, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost."<sup>22</sup>

Six of these Masters, all leading men in the university world,

<sup>20</sup> Denifle, p. 415, and pp. 416, 17, 25, 27, 28, nos. 970, 71, 72, 73, 76, 79, 80.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 415, no. 971, note 3; 440, no. 986.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 429, no. 981; 432, no. 982.



belonged to the Order of St. Dominic. They were: Peter de la Palud, Patriarch of Jerusalem; Peter of Baumes-les-Dames, then Provincial of France, and later Master General of his order; William of Chateaurenaud; William Catalot; Garin of Gy-l'Eveque, later General of the order; and Durandus of Aurillac.<sup>23</sup>

The same day, January 2, 1334, these nine and twenty master theologians forwarded John XXII a letter, expressing in polite and respectful, but clear and firm language the result of their deliberations. While affirming their filial devotion and submission to the Vicar of Christ, they recalled his express declaration that he had spoken, not as Head of the Church, defining a doctrine, but as an individual theologian, exposing a personal view; and that all theologians were permitted to give their minds on the subject. They proclaimed their firm belief in the doctrine to which they affixed their names, declared that, after the example of the apostle, they were ready to give singly a reason of the faith that was in them, and expressed a strong desire that the Pope would deign to give his apostolic sanction to their decision.<sup>24</sup>

In the light of the events that immediately followed, this joint letter, we think, clearly exerted a salutary influence on the Pontiff; for may we not refer to it John's subsequent steps as here related? On January 3, the very next day after it was forwarded to him, John held a consistory in which he showed himself more than ordinarily tolerant towards those who had opposed him, and declared anew that he had never intended dogmatically to settle the question, but had only sought, as he was still seeking, to have all possible light thrown on it, with a view to having it set at rest for all time.<sup>25</sup> Seven days later, January 10, he wrote Philip VI, declaring absolutely false the report that he had sent the Minorite, Gerard Eudes, and the Dominican, Arnold of Saint-Michael, to Paris for the purpose of winning favor or making proselytes to the doctrine

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 429, no. 981.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 432, no. 982.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 434, no. 983.

he had preached; he positively asserted that such an idea had never entered his head.<sup>26</sup> Again, on March 12, he wrote and admonished Peter Roger, Archbishop of Paris, of the order given at the late consistory, requiring cardinals, bishops and others to make a careful study of the question of the beatific vision and then to make known to the Pope the conclusion to which they should come relatively to the merits of the two debated theories on the subject.<sup>27</sup> And finally, on March 20, he informed Philip VI by letter that Father Thomas Walleys had been transferred from the prison of the Inquisition to a room in his own Papal Palace, and gave assurance that there he would be well treated.<sup>28</sup> Here the English Dominican remained a prisoner until after the election of Benedict XII, John's successor.

Feeling that he was at death's door, John XXII called to his bedside the cardinals and bishops resident at Avignon, together with the notaries public, and in their presence made a retraction of whatever he had himself preached or said, or caused others to preach or teach, on the beatific vision that was not in perfect conformity with Catholic belief. He also declared that he held with the Catholic Church that the just souls departed enjoy the vision of God immediately that they are free from all stain and debt of sin. This was on the third day of December, 1334;<sup>29</sup> and on the day following he died with sentiments of the deepest piety.

While the sermons of John XXII, his harsh measures towards his antagonists and his perpetual recurrence to the subject would seem to indicate a real and firm belief in the delay of the beatific vision, and while his adversaries, in the heat of controversy, certainly attributed that doctrine to him, still, in the light of his protests to the contrary, found at the end of his second Avignon sermon, in his letters to the Sovereign of France, and in his public profession of faith on the eve of his death, it is impossible to say that he did more than

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 437, no. 984.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 440, no. 986.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 438, no. 985.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 440, no. 987.

to advocate such an opinion tentatively, or showed more than a strong inclination to accept it, had it met with wide favor among theologians. It had but comparatively few supporters, however. It is absolutely certain that he never gave, or had any intention of giving, an *ex cathedra* definition. And were it undeniable that, in his capacity of private theologian, John firmly believed and taught such an erroneous doctrine, it would in no way militate against the Catholic dogma of papal infallibility. For while we like to consider the public acts of the Head of the Church as providential—and history often proves them to have been such,—no well-instructed Catholic holds that the Sovereign Pontiff is infallible in his private views, though made public, or that they must be accepted on faith divine. The influx of the Holy Ghost, which alone renders his judgment unerring in matters of faith and morals, is vouchsafed him only, when, acting precisely in his capacity as Vicar of Christ and teacher of the faithful, he speaks *ex cathedra*, proclaiming a truth to be believed under pain of anathema.

It is a matter of faith, of course, for Catholics that, when the Successor of Peter speaks thus officially on points of doctrine and morals—but on these only,—his pronouncements are infallible: a logical and necessary conclusion from the words of Christ: “Thou art Peter (a rock), and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” From the beginning such has been the traditional belief and teaching of the Church, though it was not formally defined until the solemn promulgation of the dogma of papal infallibility by the Vatican Council, July 18, 1870. Yet, though the records of ecclesiastical history are soiled by no such blot—a fact which, we think, is due to a special care of Divine Providence,—it has never been thought an impossibility that the Head of the Church as an individual, or a private theologian, should fall into formal heresy. No such an accusation can be laid at the door of John XXII. In no sense of the term can he be said to have been a formal heretic; for the doctrine of the immediate bestowal of the beatific vision upon the departed just soul, once it is free from all trace and

stain of sin, though generally believed, had not then been made a dogma of Catholic faith. A good lawyer and learned canonist, a fair theologian,<sup>30</sup> and possessed of splendid executive abilities, John was by nature contentious, fond of his opinions and loth to relinquish them. These traits, as often happens, became more firmly fastened on him in advanced age. Here, we believe, lies the cause of all the acrimonious discussion on the question of the beatific vision during the closing years of his life. A sincere and deeply religious man, an apostolic Pope, he never had any thought of going against what he really believed to be certainly the doctrinal teaching of the Church. As he did not authoritatively condemn the doctrine of the immediate beatific vision by his temporary opposition, so neither did he define it by his public retraction and profession of faith on the eve of his death. The honor of making the traditional belief of the Church an article of faith belongs to his successor, Benedict XII, the Carthusian, who, January 29, 1336, published his Constitution, "*Benedictus Deus*," settling the question for all Catholics.

V. F. O'DANIEL, O. P.

THE DOMINICAN COLLEGE,  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

<sup>30</sup> John XXII was not a Master in theology (Denifle, *op. cit.*, p. 427, note 4). In his letter to the French monarch, November 18, 1333, he says: "They (his antagonists) will likely have told you that we are not a Master in theology. But we may here aptly recall the saying of the wise man 'Consider, not who speaks, but what he says.'" *Ibid.*, p. 426, no. 978).



## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

**Konversations-Lexikon Ergänzungsband.** Herder, 1911. \$4.00 net.

The eight splendid volumes of Herder's Lexikon which appeared in quick succession since 1902 were reviewed briefly in the *Catholic University Bulletin* at the time of their appearance. The notices were without exception enthusiastic in their commendation of the work. A supplementary volume has just been published by Herder bringing the *Lexikon* up to 1910. The contents of this new volume range over the whole field of human interest, including events, discoveries, inventions and persons which have engaged the attention of the world since the appearance of the eighth volume. Binding, illustrations and treatment of subjects are as careful in this supplementary volume as they are throughout the work. The nine volumes sell for \$32.00 net.

It is extremely difficult nowadays for the teacher, the public leader or men and women of culture to keep abreast of the times without just such aid as that offered by this admirable *Lexikon*. Everyday life, reading and action force us into touch with all lines of human progress. Today's laboratory experiment becomes tomorrow's topic in the scientific world. Today's interests in the scientific world become tomorrow's topics in magazine, newspaper, class room, and cultured conversation. Technical terms are entering rapidly into everyday speech. Progress in the arts and sciences, in industry and in social legislation, the rise and direction of social movements, decisions of courts and plans of legislators are becoming matters of everyday vital interest to the average citizen. We must in fact in these days write and speak as Ferdinand La Salle said so boastfully of himself "armed with all the learning of the centuries." *Konversations-Lexikon* makes it possible for us to do so in a qualified way. Turning to the volume at hand we find, as an illustration, very clear and satisfactory information, accompanied by excellent illustrations, concerning the aeroplane and the dirigible balloon, phases and tendencies of recent social and

labor legislation, progress in medicine and philanthropy and in education: in a particular way in the history and action of the Church: in diet and home gymnastics. It is particularly gratifying to find in this great work the leaders and achievements, history and social aims of the Church represented in their true place in the life of the world—a service systematically neglected outside of the Church and not always done well within it. The wealth of German scholarship displayed is sufficient guarantee of the character of the contributions. The great reputation of Herders in their unique service to Catholic literature is of itself sufficient to commend the *Konversations-Lexikon* unreservedly to those familiar with the German language.

WM. J. KERBY.

---

**Fratris Rogeri Bacon Compendium Studii Theologiae.** Edidit H. Rashdall una cum appendice de Operibus Rogeri Bacon Edita per A. G. Little. Aberdoniæ: Typis Academicis, MCMXI, 16mo., pp. vi + 118.

The British Society of Franciscan Studies has conferred a signal service on all students of Bacon by the publication of this volume. For, although the opusculum here printed represents a fragment only of an uncompleted work by Bacon, it possesses, nevertheless, considerable interest and importance. In the first place, apart from the preliminary matter on the causes of error (which find a close parallel in the Introduction to the *Opus Majus* and in the *Metaphysica*), very little of the substance of the present treatise is to be found in Roger Bacon's hitherto published writings. Again, a perusal of this work goes far to confirm the view of M. Charles and others that on the whole Bacon's originality and importance as a man of science and an "Anticipator" of modern discoveries has been exaggerated, whereas his importance as a schoolman has been too much overlooked. And further, the germ of later Franciscan philosophy—that of Duns Scotus and that of William of Occam—are here to be found in Bacon's criticisms upon the dominant Thomist philosophy. But for many students, perhaps, the chief interest of the *Tractate* before us will lie largely in the historical notices which it contains about the history of philosophy in Bacon's time, the dates at which various Aristotelian treatises became known and the like.

The assertion that "almost nothing is known of the Philosophy of Aristotle" must surely be suspected of exaggeration in view of what we know from other sources of the books read in Paris prior to the year 1292, when the present book was written. Moreover, Bacon alludes to St. Thomas Aquinas as "one of the pretended authors (or authorities) famous though he be" and dwells at length upon the influence of the Franciscan Richard of Cornwall—who seems to have escaped the notice of the historians of philosophy—more especially at Oxford, where, as Dr. Rashdall remarks, the Franciscan friary "was the original home of all that was most important in the later mediæval Scholasticism."

As regards the subject matter of the compendium, it is divided into two parts. The first of these deals with the chief causes of human error. According to Bacon the principal stumbling-blocks in the way of truth (*veritatis offendicula*) are (1) The excessive influence of authority, (2) custom (*consuetudinis diuturnitas*) and (3) Vulgar opinion (*sensus multitudinis imperite*) and there is a certain irony in the fact that the writer's chief argument in favor of independent thinking as against "authority," consists mainly of a series of citations from Scripture, Cicero, Pliny and Seneca. In Book or Part II Bacon proceeds to establish the truths themselves and to "Evacuate" errors in detail.

Here we find that Bacon was more the child of his age than he imagined himself to be; for, while he admits that the proper subjects of theology should be the study of the sacred text, yet seeing that "for the last fifty years the theologians have been principally occupied with questions, as is evident to all through the treatises and *Summe* and horse-loads which have been composed by many," Roger therefore, yields to the prevailing taste and deals with the speculative philosophical questions commonly treated of by theologians.

This edition of Bacon's *Compendium* is edited from a thirteenth century MS. in the British Museum and is all the more valuable for being brought in by a critical Introduction from the pen of Dr. Hastings Rashdall of New College, Oxford, the historian of the universities of Europe in the middle ages, which covers some seventy-four pages, and which is supplemented by a series of useful notes illustrating the text.

The value of the volume is further enhanced by an appendix containing a bibliography of Roger Bacon compiled by Professor

A. G. Little, author of "The Grey Friars in Oxford" not the least attractive part of the present work. The compilation of a list of Bacon's works is a very difficult task, owing partly to Bacon's habit of rewriting his treatises again and again, so that the same works recur with different titles and different *incipits* and different works with the same title—and partly to the fact that many spurious writings are attributed to Bacon while some genuine ones are hidden under other names.

Taken as a whole, this, the latest publication of the British Society of Franciscan Studies, reflects the greatest credit upon all those concerned in its preparation.

FR. PASCHAL ROBINSON, O. F. M.

---

**La réforme de la prononciation latine**, by Camille Couillault: Préface du R. Dom Pothier, O. S. B. Published by Bloud and Co., Paris. xvii + 171.

This meritorious work written specifically for liturgical purposes, that is to bring uniformity into the rendition of Gregorian chant, possesses nevertheless a vital importance as touching the perennial question of the proper pronounciation of the Latin language. The author in the four chapters into which he has resolved his work treats successively the following topics: The pronounciation of Latin in Antiquity; here he restates the various arguments for the restored pronounciation, drawn from ancient monuments, ancient authors and from the Keil recension of the Roman grammarians, then follows the second chapter in which the necessity of a unified reform in the matter of pronounciation is discussed. The third chapter deals with the opportunity of reform offered by present conditions. The fourth and last chapter then proposes the Italian pronounciation as a compromise among the various pronounciations now in use. His reasons for this compromise is that the Italian pronounciation is not the best but the most attainable. It stands midway between the extremes and therefore can be adopted with less effort than any other system. No fault can be found with the author's conclusion except that he makes it a compromise. It is true the Italian pronounciation would be easy of adoption, it is



equally true that it rests on firmer grounds than this ease of adoption. The Roman pronunciation, called also the phonetic and the restored pronunciation, is predicated on the assumption that somewhere in the past ages the Latin language died, that it is a dead language and that therefore the pronunciation of the Classic Period must be recovered and restored.

The Latin language however has had a continuous and unbroken existence in the Catholic Church down to the present day, hence the pronunciation in use in the Capital City of the Church rests on reasons much more valid than those of compromise. It is an ascertained law of language that pronunciation does change and so it would seem that the pronunciation in use now by the Church is the logical pronunciation to adopt. No logic whatever attaches to the argument for the restored pronunciation. Indeed it would be quite as logical for us who use English to restore the pronunciation in vogue in the time of Shakespeare as it is for Latin scholars to attempt to restore to use the pronunciation of the time of Cicero. The work otherwise is scholarly and doubtless will do much to settle this vexed question. It is also accompanied by a letter of approval from His Eminence, the Cardinal Secretary of State.

JOHN D. MAGUIRE.

---

**La venerable Louise de Marillac**, Mademoiselle Le Gras. Par le prince Emmanuel de Broglie, 1 vol. in 12 de la collection "Les Saints." Paris, Victor Lecoffre. J. Gabalda et Cie, 1911. Pp. viii + 219.

Though there are many biographies of the venerable woman, who so efficiently collaborated with St. Vincent de Paul in his great works for the relief of human suffering, it is eminently fitting that another should be written to form part of the Lecoffre series. The author, who is well known for his life of St. Vincent de Paul, makes no attempt at a minute or elaborate narrative in this work of the life and works of the first Sister of Charity. He has succeeded, however, in bringing out the qualities of mind and heart, which joined to the most fervent love for Jesus Christ, enabled this truly wonderful woman to lay the foundation for the great works of charity towards the sick and the poor, which are evidenced

by the manifold activities of the Sisters of Charity in all lands at the present. Her simple career is told in language free from exaggeration, and her life is revealed from her birth until her death when she had the satisfaction of seeing the great work which she had undertaken grow and multiply in many places outside the scenes of her first activities. Louise de Marillac was declared Venerable by Pope Leo XIII on June 10th, 1895, and though the prudent tardiness of Rome has delayed her canonization, the author expresses the hope that before long she may be invoked together with her spiritual father and guide St. Vincent. Her work remains. The congregation which at her death numbered 250 members living in sixty houses, today reaches the total of more than 24,000 members carrying on the work of the founders in more than 3,000 institutions in all quarters of the globe.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**Saint Patrick.** Par M. l'Abbé Riguet, curé de Saint-Denis de l'Hotel (Loiret). 1 vol. in 12mo de la collection "Les Saints." Victor Lecoffre, J. Gabalda et Cie, Paris, 1911. Pp. ix + 203.

The life of the patron saint of Ireland is a subject which year by year attracts attention from an ever-widening circle of scholars and historians. In the preparation of this work the author took advantage of the excellent monograph on St. Patrick by Professor Bury, and was not compelled to devote himself to criticisms of the theories, many of which Professor Bury had so effectually disposed of. Several chapters are devoted by M. Riguet to the religious conditions in pre-Christian Ireland and to the early life and fortunes of St. Patrick; but, as might be expected, because of the narrow limits imposed on him by the general plan and scope of this series of lives, it was not possible to do more than to state what may be regarded as well-established conclusions. The life of St. Patrick is narrated without any attempt at detail, and with little reference to the controversies which attach to each step of his career. His birth-place, his captivity, his education, his mission, and his apostolic journeys are all gone over with a complete absence of the polemical spirit. Considering the difficulties of the task and the larger mass of work that still remains to be done regarding the sources for the life of St. Patrick and the early history of

Christianity in Celtic lands, it is better perhaps that the purely technical side of the work was not accentuated in a volume mainly intended for popular reading. A good example of the author's method can be found in chapter VIII on the organisation of the Church in Ireland where every step bristles with difficulties.

There are some appendices containing a short account of the sources and literature for the life of St. Patrick and some notes on some features of Zimmer's theory of the introduction of Christianity to Ireland and its apostle.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**Le Cardinal Vaughan.** Par Paul Thureau-Dangin, de l'Académie française. Bloud et Cie. Paris, 1911. Pp. 127.

This little work is merely a summary of the extended biography of Cardinal Vaughan by Snead-Coxe. Though it contains nothing that cannot be found in the earlier work it is valuable if for no other reason than that it contains the views of the author of *La renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*. Those who are interested in the great Catholic awakening in England during the last century have seen the principal figures of that movement gradually take the places to which time and the wider insight into action and its results have been consigning them. As the years go on the figure of Cardinal Vaughan will be brought more and more into contrast with Newman, Wiseman and Manning, their labors for the cause which they upheld so bravely will be judged more impartially, and their stature as leaders and teachers will come into clearer view. This process is already evident in the work before us, and though inchoate it indicates how the unrelenting hand of the historian falls on those who become the subjects of his pen.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**The Story of the Bridgettines.** By Francesca M. Steele (Darley Dale). Benziger Bros. New York, 1910. Pp. 292.

This work contains a very satisfactory though brief life of St. Bridget the Swedish saint whose mystic life found concrete expression in the foundation of the order of Bridgettines. Many

sources have been laid under contribution in bringing together much well-digested information regarding St. Bridget and her daughter St. Catherine. In addition there is a brief description of the peculiar rule of the Bridgettines, providing as it did, a method for regulating in the most minute particulars the daily life of the members of the community. Though the number of nuns in each convent was limited to sixty, the peculiar organisation of the separate communities and the rigor of the rule did not prevent the order from being widely extended. The author gives an account of the various foundations in England, Russia, Denmark, Poland, Holland, Belgium and Bavaria and shows what sad havoc the Reformation played with the convents in most of these countries. The interest of the narrative is still further enhanced by the fact to which the author adverts as one of her reasons for writing the history of the Bridgettines, that they "enjoy the unique privilege of being the only pre-Reformation order of women in England of which the English branch has survived the storm that cut off all the unhappy countries over which it swept from the Catholic Church; after nearly three hundred years of exile the Bridgettine community originally so famous at Lyon House, Islesworth, is now established at Chudleigh in Devonshire.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

---

**Les Récits de la Chambrée**, par l'abbé Georges Ambler. Paris, G. Beauchesne et Cie., 1911. 8o., pp. xxviii + 300.

This book pays a high tribute to the army chaplain who, brave and faithful in war and in peace, has always been the friend and confidant of the soldier. Since the official suppression of this post in the French Army in 1880, the chaplain *Volontaire* has left nothing undone to protect the soldier's faith against the dangers of barrack life.

We have no doubt that in these days of antimilitarism and *sans-patrie*, in France, the stories of l'abbé Ambler will be a great incentive to the young generation to imitate the religious faith and military virtues of their predecessors, and should the occasion arise they will prove that even war can be a cause of civilization, and that the "Vae Victis" of antiquity has made room for "Pro Deo" and "Pro Patria," words of eternal religion and civic duty.



## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

*The Protestant Magazine* published at Washington, D. C., reproduces in its second quarter issue of 1911, pp. 104-109, a few pages from a work of Dr. Chr. Wordsworth. The citation includes in part the original and English translation of a pretended Catholic confession of faith, said to have been imposed on Hungarian converts from Protestantism. It is generally known as the "Hungarian Flucht formular" or formula of malediction. Among other articles the newly-made converts were, before being admitted into the Catholic Church, asked to confess "that the most holy Pope ought to be honored by all with divine honor, with the greater genuflection, due to Christ himself; that the reading of Holy Scripture is the origin of heresy, and schism, and the source of blasphemy; that to receive the Eucharist under one kind is good and salutary; and to receive it under both is heretical and damnable; that Mary, the Blessed Virgin, is worthy of greater honor from men and angels, than Christ himself, the Son of God." The same converts, moreover, were made to accurse the parents who had educated them "in that heretical (Protestant) faith."

This surely is "a remarkable document" as the *Protestant Magazine* entitles its article. It is evidently only with the very best of reasons that we ought to attribute such horrible teachings as the above citation contains to any denomination whether Catholic or non-Catholic. But the *Protestant Magazine* does not heed such an elementary consideration. It relies on the "Letters to M. Goudon" by Chr. Wordsworth, D. D., although the mere title of the book if it were completely quoted would reveal the character of the work: "Letters to M. Goudon on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome both in Religion and Polity." It does not tell its readers that when Chr. Wordsworth published his *Letters* containing the alleged confession the latter document was repudiated by the *Dublin*

*Review* as a forgery. It is a pardonable offense of course, for the *Protestant Magazine* not to be acquainted with the *Dublin Review*. A careful perusal, however, of the later editions of Chr. Wordsworth's *Letters* would necessarily have forced the standpoint of the *Dublin Review* (Vol. xxii (1847), pp. 455-56; Vol. xxiv, 290-92) on its attention. With its authority, Chr. Wordsworth, the *Protestant Magazine* seems to believe that the confession must be genuine because it was edited by Streitwolf "who appears to have been a Roman Catholic" (*Prot. Mag.*, p. 104, note). Now, Streitwolf was not a Catholic, but a Protestant minister of Bodenfeld in Hanover. Moreover, he did not edit the confession. He died in 1836 and the second volume of his publication, the one in which this confession is found was published only in 1838. It was published by Kleuer, who was, like Streitwolf, a Protestant.

The *Confession* is no Roman Catholic document, but a wretched hoax first published in 1676 by the Calvinistic preacher George Lani. It was probably forged by Lani himself who brought it out, after sentence of death had been pronounced against him for treasonable machinations and after he had been fortunate enough to effect his escape. Standard works written by Protestants on creeds and confessions, such as Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom* maintain an ominous silence concerning its existence. A lengthy and thorough article on "Confessions" by W. A. Curtis in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (Vol. III, pp. 831-901) knows nothing of its existence. It has been conclusively proved to be a forgery by Gordanski (1822), Giefers (Paderborn, 1866) and more recently by Duhr in his *Jesuitenfabeln* (fifth edition). This stupid forgery bears on its face its own condemnation, yet it continues to be circulated by Protestant writers, perhaps on the principle that nothing is too vile or abominable to be uttered concerning the religion of Catholics, thus making the end justify the means.

## UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

---

**Advent Course.** During the season of Advent, Reverend Doctor E. T. Shanahan delivered a course of Sunday sermons at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York. The titles of the sermons were:

- I.—The Dissembling of Truth.
- II.—The Spirit of the Church and the Temper of the Times.
- III.—Progress and Guidance.
- IV.—The Christian Doctrine of Life and its Critics.
- V.—Bethlehem and the Social Future of Man.

**Lectures by Dr. Turner.** Reverend Doctor William Turner will deliver a course of six lectures on Medieval Philosophy at the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, N. Y., during the months of January and February. The following are the dates and the titles:

- January 5.—St. Augustine, the Plato of Latin Christianity.
- January 12.—John the Scot, and the ninth century.
- January 19.—Gerbert (Pope Sylvester II) and the tenth century.
- January 26. St. Anselm and the eleventh century.
- February 2.—Abelard and the twelfth century.
- February 9.—St. Thomas and the thirteenth century.

**Annual Collection for 1910.** From the Rector's *Report* it is seen that the Annual Collection for 1910 amounted to \$95,464.27; the amount for 1909 was \$97,181.21.

**Financial Condition of the University.** The Annual Report of the Treasurer shows that the University has no debts and that its investments have reached the figure of \$1,178,825.43.

**Visit of Reverend Doctor Hyvernat.** During the Christmas holidays Reverend Doctor Hyvernat paid a visit to the



University for the purpose of supervising the work of the graduate students, which he has been conducting by correspondence during his year's leave of absence.

**Publications by Professors.** The Appendix to the Rector's Report contains more than a hundred titles of publications by professors of the University during the year 1910-1911. These include text-books, monograph studies, magazine articles, articles in encyclopedias, and lectures.